



**SRI**  
**VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY**  
**ORIENTAL JOURNAL**  
**TIRUPATI**



**EDITOR**  
**Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D.**  
*Director, Oriental Research Institute*

# CONTENTS

## ENGLISH

1. Dhvani and Rasa <i>Dr. K. Krishnà Moorthy</i>	...	1
2. Purpose—Philosophical and Grammatical— in Indian Tradition <i>Dr. Siddheshwar Varma</i>	...	11
3. Glimpses of Pāṭaliputra in the Gupta Age <i>Sri Jagannath Agrawal</i>	...	17
4. Are Ānandānubhava and Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka Identical? <i>Sri D. Satyanarayana</i>	...	21
5. Ellora Plates of Dantidurga <i>Sri Sadhu Ram</i>	...	33
6. Rasiko Nāṭaḥ <i>Dr. K.S. Ramamurti</i>	...	43
7. Bhartṛhari on 'Viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ' of Pāṇini <i>Dr. M.S. Narayana Murti</i>	...	49
8. Reverence to God in the Jaivansh <i>Dr. Ram Dutt Sharma</i>	...	63

## REVIEWS

9. a. Śrīpraśnasamhitā b. Bhāratīyavṛttam <i>Dr. V. Varadachari</i>	...	69
---	-----	----

## SANSKRIT

1. ईश्वरवादः <i>Sri K. Achyuta Potuval</i>	...	1
2. कथं व्युत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या ? <i>Dr. V. Krishnaswami Iyengar</i>	...	7

## TELUGU

1. కరుణాద్భుతము <i>Dr. T. Kotiswara Rao</i>	...	1
--	-----	---





Dr. K. KRISHNA MOORTHY

## DHVANI AND RASA\*

In the history of Indian aesthetic thought, the concept of *rasa* is the oldest since Bharata himself gives in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* some citations from earlier works which already refer to *rasa*. His greatness lay in giving it a vital and central place in his scheme of tenfold plays and explaining it in terms of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva* schematically. It appears that all the elements in a play, namely plot, characterisation, style, setting and acting are governed by the dictates of *rasa*. His famous *rasa-sūtra* led to diverse explanations at the hands of later philosophers, the chief of whom are Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinavagupta. We also know for certain that poets like Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti and Māgha were quite conversant with the general outlines of the *rasa* theory. Nor need we have any doubt that early theorists like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Udbhaṭa and Rudraṭa accepted by and large the value of *rasa* in poetry too. In their thought and ready analysis of poetry which was by definition beautiful, they had only two heads – *śabda* (sound) and *artha* (sense); and all aspects of beauty had to be subsumed under the one or the other head. Thus beautiful sound comprised of *śabdālaṅkāras* involving the principles of alliteration and rhyme. The beauty of sense or meaning could primarily lie in the poet's artistic turn of thought or imaginative creation called *vakrokti* and a number of figures of speech were defined and illustrated. In such a scheme there is no wonder that the beauty of emotional content due to *rasa*, *bhāva*, etc., also came to be recognised only as certain *alaṅkāras*, namely *rasavad*, *preyas*, *ūrjasvin*, *udātta* and *samāhita*, or as certain *guṇas*. In general terms, the ancient theorists also affirmed the desirability of infusing *Mahākāvyas* with all the *rasas* to sustain interest.

It will be seen that this broad idea of beauty in literature, analysable into *alaṅkāra* or *guṇa* is in no way adequate to explain the unique essence of all literature. If we want a dependable yardstick to distinguish gradations in poetic success, the *alaṅkāra-cum-guṇa* scheme cannot take us far. Even the doctrines of *mārga* or *riti* or *saṅghaṭanā* will be found insufficient to arrive at precise literary estimates of poets of varying degrees of achievement.

The more we study *alaṅkāras* the more puzzled we become when asked whether they are merely means of ornamentation or forms of the resulting beauty itself. This is the famous distinction between *alaṅkāra* and *alaṅkārya* which we owe to the searching philosophy of *Dhvani*, formulated for the first time in the *Dhvanyāloka* by Ānandavardhana. The differentia of poetry cannot be rendered precise until it can mark off the boundaries of poetic language from other uses of language. We have common parlance as well as scientific use of language. We may utilise some *alaṅkāras* and *guṇas* in our daily conversation as well as scientific writing. Would our activity be really poetic on such occasions? In fact we all know that while every educated man can understand ordinary human talk as well as scientific discourse, not all educated men can appreciate poetry. There is such a thing as taste or sensibility required on our part to understand and appreciate a poem. Again, what about the varying temperaments and moods of poets? What exactly do they want to achieve by their work and can we know when they have succeeded or when they have failed? Such are some of the considerations which prompted Ānandavardhana to re-interpret the earlier concept and to propound the theory of *Dhvani* as the best and most adequate explanation of aesthetic experience or *rasa* in literature. The new principle of *dhvani* or suggestion is so formulated that it not only solves all these issues effectively but also meets with the approval of accredited experts in linguistics, logic and semantics.

It is Ānandavardhana's contention that only the *Dhvani* theory can logically explain all the facts of the poetic process to the satisfaction of the creative poet on the one hand and the appreciative critic on the other. When we say logic, we should not forget that the logic of poetry is not the same as logic in other fields; it is a magic indeed which eludes the logic we are used to outside poetry. But to establish it with unassailable arguments to the satisfaction of confirmed skeptics is no easy task and the several threads of argument that lie scattered in the *Dhvanyāloka* and *Locanā* all converging to the one centre of *rasa* are more often than not missed even by a wary student. I propose to indicate some of them in the course of this lecture.

*Rasa* indeed is the corner stone of the arch of *dhvani*. It is first and foremost an aesthetic canon. *Rasa* is that which initially inspires

the poet into creativity and ultimately ensures the aesthetic delight of the critic. In life there is ample joy and pain, but no *rasa* or pleasurable relish of them. Impersonal disinterested and universal delight is exclusive to poetry and termed *rasa*. Even spiritual bliss, termed sometimes *rasa* in the Upaniṣadic language (cf. *raso vai saḥ*) differs from *kāv्यarasa* in so far as it does not follow any prescribed course of *yoga* but is more or less a result of inborn taste. If poetry is thus *sui generis*, it is only because of *rasa*; and it is this paramount status of *rasa* which has to be emphasized in any adequate analysis of poetic beauty. We shall see how only the theory of *Dhvani* answers to this description.

The thesis of the *Dhvani* theorist can be simply stated :— *Dhvani* is the quintessence of poetry; and *rasa* is the quintessence of *dhvani*. What then is *dhvani*? *Dhvani* is an exclusively poetic feature concerned with exploiting the beauty of every element in the medium of language like *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa* and *riti* to serve the ultimate artistic end of *rasa*. In other words *dhvani* is the name of the whole poetic process itself which for want of a better equivalent in English is usually rendered as 'suggestion'. This marks it off from the conventional capacity of language to give accepted meanings, meanings shared by all the community in their social or intellectual intercourse. It marks it off from the secondary or figurative usage of language too whose province does not include *rasa*. In other words *dhvani* is that meaning in poetry which is appreciated by the critic as most beautiful, knowingly or unknowingly. The beauty of *vāc्यārtha* or explicit meaning and *lakṣyārtha* or implicit meaning is only an outer aspect of poetic beauty. Words and common meanings in poetry are no doubt used by the poet with an eye to beauty. This is exactly what is described by the ancient concepts of *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa* and *riti* or *vṛtti*. But the soul or core-essence of poetry is not adequately explained by any or all of them. The concept of *alaṅkāra* or embellishment demands an *alaṅkārya* or a subject to be embellished. The concept of *guṇa* too requires a subject which it qualifies. The doctrines of *riti* and *vṛtti* too become meaningful only in relation to the essence of poetry and not otherwise. The ancients in their theorising were getting gradually wiser about the special and unique status of *rasa*, but none pitched upon the only complete explanation, namely *dhvani*. Thus to speak of *rasa* as an *alaṅkāra* of a special class, called *rasavadādi* shows only a very vague awareness of the problem; regarding *rasa* as a *guṇa* is an improvement upon it. To associate it with *riti* and *vṛtti* is certainly a further improvement, since both these are more abstract than *alaṅkāra* and *guṇa*. But the logical culmination of aesthetic theory is held in an open recognition of the inmost essence of poetry as exclusively *rasa*; and this is done only by the concept of *dhvani*.

If the task of the *Dhvani*-theorist is rendered easy in a way by

the concepts already in the field, it is also hampered in another way because the beauty already analysed has to be accommodated properly in the new explanation in a scientific manner. In the analytical method of the ancients, poetry is seen in its elements of *śabda* or sound and *artha* or sense. So *alaṅkāras* or *guṇas* are features, outer or inner, of only *śabda* or *artha* or both. All that their synthetic grasp could formulate was *rīti* or *racanā* or style and *vyūtti* or mode of acting in drama and mode of alliteration in poetry. The new theorist had to arrive at a new perspective to urge the claim of *rasa* to greater recognition in its own right, without underestimating the value of the earlier findings in the field. That the *Dhvani* theory meets the challenge boldly is indeed its best claim on our attention.

Unless this new perspective of *dhvani* is realised, we miss the very message of the *Dhvanyāloka*. What is wanted is a finer analysis in our general notion of beauty itself. That beauty or *cārutā* exists at many levels is the first theorem of Ānandavardhana. Grant this and the rest will follow as corollaries. The beauty of *vācakaśabda* and *vācyaṛtha* is no doubt explained by the concepts of *alaṅkāra* and *guṇa*; but this beauty is quite distinct from the beauty of *vyāgyārtha* whose most celebrated representative is *rasa*. We should not commit the mistake of thinking that the two are exclusive in the best passages of poetry. On the other hand they mostly co-exist. But what is incumbent on the critic is the exercise of his aesthetic judgement in arriving at a clear decision about the relative prominence of the two kinds of beauty in any given passage. If the critic feels that the beauty of the expressed element (*vācya* out) shines the beauty of the suggested (*vyāgya*), it helps him to rate that passage as second-rate poetry. If on the other hand, when he is convinced that the suggested beauty surpasses the beauty of the expressed, he will rate it as *dhvanikāvya* or first rate poetry. If the suggested element is almost negligible in appeal, it will be third-rate poetry.

It is only from such a perspective involving the criterion of *vyāgya-prādhānya* that the nature and scope of *rasa* can be realised fully in the *Dhvani* theory. Only when all the elements of *vācya-vācaka* charm stop attracting attention to themselves and participate generously in contributing to the supremacy of the *vyāgya* effect, namely *rasa* we get real *dhvani*.<sup>1</sup>

Though theoretically sound, this canon involves some practical difficulties. When there is clear recognition of diverse elements of beauty like *alaṅkāra* and *rasa*, it may go difficult to decide their relative superiority. So Ānandavardhana gives us an unfailing guideline to show

1. *vācyavācakaśārutvāhetūnām vividhātmanām /  
rasādīparatā yatra sa dhvaner viśayo mataḥ* // DA. II. 4.

the way out. One need not despair that all *rasa*, *bhāva*, etc., are as a rule suggested and the suggested must be superior to expressed beauty. Ānandavardhana says that *rasādis* also may be suggested and yet remain *aṅga* or subsidiary to the *aṅgi* or principal beauty of *vācya*.<sup>1</sup> This is the famous *aṅga-aṅgi-bhāva* extended to the relation between *rasa* and *alaṅkāra* for the first time by Ānandavardhana. Before his time theorists were aware of this relationship between two *alaṅkāras* only (as in *saṅkara*) or between two *rasas* only. But in Ānandavardhana's system it can hold good between an *alaṅkāra* and a *rasa* too.

The implications of this indeed are far reaching. If *rasa* is subsidiary, it loses its claim to the title of *dhvani* and acquires the lower status of *rasavad-alaṅkāra*. It means that *rasa* has a dual role in poetry. It may be both *dhvani* and *alaṅkāra* depending on the intention of the poet. From this follows the dictum that the status of an *alaṅkāra* is always lower than that of *dhvani*. This is the most intriguing and confusing part of the *dhvani* argument. Again and again we are told that what is suggested in poetry is more intrinsic and aesthetic than what is merely denoted, that *vyaṅgya-cārutva* is *ipso facto* superior to *vācyacārutva*. We are also told that *rasādis* are never *vācya* but exclusively *vyaṅgya*. How then can be the beauty of *vyaṅgya-rasa* be ever subordinated to any other? Is it not a contradiction in terms to speak of *rasādis* as *alaṅkāra* which is only a *vācyasaundaryaprakāra*?

Such an apparent contradiction is dictated by the exigencies of facts in poetry and cannot be rated by mere considerations of logic. If the intrinsic status of *rasa* is one thing, its functional status in poetry may be another. A mere presence or touch of suggestion *vyaṅgya-saṁsparśa* does not constitute *dhvani*; what constitutes *dhvani* is *vyaṅgya* which is also exclusively important in relation to other elements of beauty in the poem. It must be realised at the outset that various elements of beauty will be co-existing in any instance of good poetry. Some of them will be *vācya* and some of them may be *vyaṅgya*. The relative prominence of the *vācya* over the *vyaṅgya*, or *vice versa*, will alone be the decisive factor in deciding whether something is *alaṅkāra* or *dhvani*. Thus we have a new philosophy of *alaṅkāra* also in the *Dhvani* system which is different from that of the Old School. Any element of beauty which subserves the beauty of another comes to be styled *alaṅkāra*. According to this new definition, then, *rasa* can be deemed *alaṅkāra* in examples like *kṣipto hastāvalagnaḥ*. The mistake of the ancient theorists lay in the fact that they deemed even principally suggested *rasādis* as *alaṅkāras*, though logically they could only remain *alaṅkārya* totally distinct from *alaṅkāras*.

2 *pradhāne 'nyatra vākyūrthe yatrāṅgaṁ tu rasādayah [*  
*kūṇḍe tasminn alaṅkāro rasādir iti me matiḥ ||* *ibid.* II 5.

Apart from *rasādis*, coming to the *vācya-alāṅkāras* themselves, it may be asked what their *alāṅkārya* is. This is a question raised only by Ānandavardhana. His answer is that it is mostly *vastu*, or the idea intended by the poet. Every poem has a theme or subject or idea which is its *vastu*. This may be conveyed directly or figuratively, or suggestively. Thus we can speak of *vācya*, *lakṣya* and *vyāṅgya vastu*. It is not impossible that one or more of these co-exist in a poem. What involves the exercise of a critic's judgement is the task of deciding which of them provides the final resting place (*saṁvid-viśrānti*) in his understanding of the poem. Now it may be the one; now the other. This freedom and impreciseness is of the very essence of poetry. It cannot be ordered to any logical rule. All that the *Dhvani* theory states is that *vācya-vastu*, or *alāṅkāra*, however beautiful in itself, must be reckoned as inferior to the *vyāṅgya-vastu* or *alāṅkāra* or *rasa*.

It will be seen how the *vyāṅgya* element is regarded as threefold as against the *vācya* element which is only twofold. That is because of the unique nature of *rasa* which can never be *vācya*. By reciting the names of *rasas* like *śṛṅgāra*, *hāsyā*, *karuṇā* we do not feel love, mirth or sorrow. They can only be suggested by a proper manipulation of the antecedents, consequents and incidental moods of characters in a situation suited to the sentiments concerned. So, then, though *rasa* is never *vācya*, *vastu* and *alāṅkāra* however can be both *vācya* and *vyāṅgya*.

What we have in poetry is the varying juxtaposition of *vācya* and *vyāṅgya* elements. Let us look at the logical possibilities: The two *vācya* elements and the three *vyāṅgya* ones make five in all. In all poetry the first *vācya-vastu* must be invariably present. It may be associated with either *vācya-alāṅkāra* or a *vyāṅgya-vastu* or a *vyāṅgya-alāṅkāra* or a *vyāṅgya-rasādi*. Now *vācya-vastu* + *vācya-alāṅkāra* is only *alāṅkāra* in the new system, because the two belong to the same functional order. But when the two orders are interposed, the resultant beauty demands the exercise of the critic's judgement. Thus in *vācya-alāṅkāra* + *vyāṅgya-vastu*, it will be regarded as *alāṅkāra* only if the beauty of the *vyāṅgya-vastu* is subsidiary to the beauty of the *vācya*. This is known as the principle of *guṇibhūta-vyāṅgya* which adequately explains all the *alāṅkāras* without denying the suggested element in them. On this principle indeed, *vyāṅgya-rasa* too is regarded as *rasavad-alāṅkāra*. But if the *vyāṅgya-vastu* or *alāṅkāra* or *rasa* is not subsidiary to the *vācya*, but surpassing the rest in beauty, then these come to be raised to the highest state of *dhvani*. This is the functional philosophy underlying the three divisions of *vyāṅgyārtha* into *vastu-dhvani*, *alāṅkāra-dhvani* and *rasa-dhvani*. Unless something is exclusively and relatively all important it won't be classed as *dhvani*. However, of the three the province of *rasa-dhvani* is not only the largest but also the sweetest. Its nature is such that it cannot but colour every minute ingredient or

aspect of poetry on the one hand and every class of *dhvani* on the other. In poetry, language is used uniquely because the poet endeavours to convey emotions, moods and feelings in addition to mere facts and actions. Even such hard and dry things like stones and bones become associated with some mental feeling like anguish; and therefore, even in seemingly *rasa*-less passages of poetry a perspective and sensitive reader will experience some shade or the other of *rasādi*. So the logically distinct categories of *vastu-dhvanī* and *alaṅkāra-dhvanī* cannot be deemed to be totally exclusive of *rasa* any time. Once we theoretically admit that *dhvani* is the essence of best poetry to do full justice to the claims of *rasa*, we cannot rule out logically the application of that definition to *vastu-dhvanī* and *alaṅkāra-dhvanī* also. These latter two are definitely more aesthetic than their *vācya* counterparts and they also in some measure at least partake of the healing touch of *rasa* which is not however prominent enough to be classed as *rasa-dhvanī*.

Such a wide theory embracing all varieties of *vastu*, *alaṅkāra*, and *rasa-dhvanī* in the category of best poetry is also practically more serviceable than a theory restricted to *rasa*. In Prakrit folk-poetry abounding in examples of subtle wit and clever hints to love assignations, the canon of *rasa* cannot apply in *toto*, though their appeal to the intelligent reader is unquestioned. These are best explained as *vastu-dhvanī* suggested by the unique nature of the characters and the situation in question. Similarly, great poets have shown their preference in leaving certain figurative ideas and images suggested instead of openly expressing them as in prose. Actually, the term *alaṅkāra-dhvanī* is a misnomer. What is suggested now is only a *vastu* and it should be strictly called *vastu-dhvanī* only. But to distinguish this *vastu* which is due to *kavi-samaya* from other *vastus*, we refer to its general status elsewhere as *alaṅkāra* and call it *alaṅkāra-dhvanī* after the analogy of *Brāhmaṇa-śramṇa-nyāya* which is similar to our reference to some as Brahmin-Christians today.

Theoretically too, exclusion of *vastu-dhvanī* and *alaṅkāra-dhvanī*, would land us in a hopelessly miserable state in establishing the aesthetic value of *vyañgya* as superior to *vācya* when we are confronted in argument by learned logicians and grammarians and the like who can be presumed to understand only *vyañgya-vastu* as distinct from *vācya-vastu* and not also *vyañgya-rasa*, because *vyañgya-rasa* is by definition something that can be felt only by the few gifted ones called *sahṛdayas* or *rasikas* and outside the reach of merely learned specialists. Hence *vastu-dhvanī* examples only are cited to convince such hard-boiled skeptics and *rasa-dhvanī* illustrations are avoided.

All this carries the implicit assumption that there is such a unique function of language as suggestion over and above the two well

known functions called denotation and indication. The Mīmāṃsakas and other philosophers who are supposed to be experts in this matter have nowhere spoken of this function. Even in Bhartṛhari's philosophy of Sanskrit grammar, there is a sort of predilection to assume an almost mystical 'revealing power' to explain the evolution of all meaning from sound forms in terms of *śphoṭa* or *śabdabrahman*. If what is exclusive to poetry is a unique speciality—a speciality not figured out by all philosophers of language, there is no wonder at all; and that speciality can be none other than *rasa* or aesthetic experience of the reader as ably pointed out by Abhinavagupta while dismissing the *bhāktavāda*. The theory of secondary meaning is differently held by different schools and can be conveniently widened to include all meanings other than the conventional one; yet it cannot explain or cover the fact of *rasa-dhvani* showing its inadequacy to explain literature. Even the best advocate of *lakṣaṇā* can only plead for some varieties of *vastu-dhvani* (namely *avivakṣitavācya*) as covered by forms of *lakṣaṇā*; but the vast bulk of literary charm lies outside that limited sphere.

While classifying *dhvani* varieties, Ānandavardhana gives such significant titles as remind us of the relative status of *vācya* all the time. Under this logical scheme *rasādi dhvani* comes to be styled *asamlakṣyakrama-vyāṅgya*. That is to say, the *vyāṅgya-rasa* is felt almost simultaneous with the comprehension of the *vācārtha*. The logical time sequence between the two becomes so thin as to escape notice. This is compared to the quick piercing of a hundred lotus leaves placed one above the other with a needle in the shortest span of one second. Abhinavagupta is our authority on aesthetic psychology and on the state of the reader during *rasāsvāda*. But Ānandavardhana spares us from any account of these. By the term *rasa* he refers not only to the reader's aesthetic response and to the poet's creative afflatus which are both subjective but to the permanent states or *sthāyibhāvas* objectively embodied in the poem through characters and plot. The characters are the seat of such *rasas* and there can be opposition between two *rasas* like love and detachment or pathos when they are *dhvani* but not when they are only *rasavad-alakāra*. The fleeting mental states or *vyabhicāribhāvas* of Bharata are simply referred to as *bhāvas* without any epithet. The other constituents of the *rasādi* group are the *ābhāsas*, *uddīpana*, *prāsama*, *sandhi*, *śābalatā*, etc., of the *rasas* and *bhāvas* with varying degrees of intermixture and pitch. We have no time to dwell on their details here.

Ānandavardhana criticises the summary treatment of *rasavad-alakāra* by the ancients. He hoists with their own petard. It is their credo that the province of each *alakāra* must be different without any room for overlapping and hence their definitions are carefully constructed from this point of view guarding against the fallacies of 'too broad



and 'too narrow'. But when *rasa* is primarily felt in a passage replete with human emotional behaviour and it is characterised as *rasavad-alañkāra*, either they should mean that other figures like the simile have no scope there or if their co-existence is admitted, they will have to give up the postulate that figures like the simile have an exclusive field of their own. For in literature sentient emotional behaviour of some sort or the other will be attributed even to inanimate objects in nature and figures like the simile will have no scope at all left to them uncovered by *rasavad-alañkāra*. If on the other hand they deny such attributed sentiment the name of *rasavad-alañkāra*, they will be branding some of the best examples of *rasa* as *rasa*-less, exposing themselves to the charge that they are lacking in taste. They are thus concerned by the two horns of the dilemma. The only way out is to distinguish primarily beautiful *rasādi* which is *dhvani* from *rasādi* subserving another element in the poem and which is *rasavad-alañkāra*. Thus in the new scheme, even other *alañkāras* like *preyas* of the early theorists will come to be designated as *rasavad-alañkāra* only.

Such a realisation of the vital role of *rasādis* entitling them to the rank of *dhvani* will help immensely in the revaluation of the other concepts also. It will at once stand out how *guṇas* stand apart from *alañkāras*. The *guṇas* though felt as inhering in *śabdārthas* really belong to *rasas* only in their variety. Some *rasas* like *śṛṅgāra* and *karuṇa* melt the hearts of readers and are styled *madhura* or soft and sweet. Some others like *vīra*, *raudra* and *bībhatsa* rouse our hearts and are styled as characterised by *ojas* or brilliance. Besides these two, only one more *guṇa* is enough to explain the common effectiveness of all *rasas* and all *racanās* and that is *prasāda* or lucidity.

Ānandavardhana dwells on the *vyañjakatva* or suggestive charm of each minute element in poetry like syllable, base, affix, termination, word, gender, number, collocation of compounds or otherwise sentence, paragraph, canto and whole work – only in relation to *rasa-dhvanī*. From the minute attention of early theorists to parts of *vācya-vācaka*, he turns out attention to the much more profitable task of analysis of *vyaṅgya-vyañjaka* from parts to the whole. He affirms that beauty so detected alone is the most significant aspect of beauty in poetry. If the *vācya* aspect is exclusively taken into account, the only significant charm detected will be of *prasāda-guṇa* or lucidity in addition. If we leave out *vācya* also from consideration the only charm holding our attention would be alliteration and so forth.<sup>3</sup>

3. *rasādisamarpaṇasāmarthyam eva naisargikam śabdānām viśeṣa itī vyañjakatvāśrayyeva teṣām mukhyaṁ cārutvaṁ vācakaivāśrayāṇām tu prasāda evārthāpekṣāyām teṣām viśeṣaḥ. arthānapekṣāyām tu anuprāsādir eva*, DA, p. 360, Lālapriyā edn.

All this clarification by Ānandavardhana is meant to render more cogent Udbhaṭa's idea that particular words alone are suited for particular *rasas*. We are indebted to Abhinavagupta for citing *Bhāmahavivaraṇa* by name in this context (p. 358). To what extent Udbhaṭa had gone beyond the early theorisings in his *Bhāmahavivaraṇa* is unknown; but it is clear that Ānandavardhana was not fabricating anything preposterous or very new and which was not already hinted at in glimmering flashes of earlier thinkers.

Only the implications of this general theory on poetic creation and critical appreciation remain to be glanced at in conclusion. The testimony cited in the *Dhvanyāloka* of the most celebrated Ādikavi Vālmīki himself as unburdening his *śoka* or sentiment of pathos through the outlet of a spontaneous outburst, namely *śloka* is more than clinching. It proves that the creative process is spurred into activity at all because of *rasāvēśa*. The spell of *rasa* or overmastering passion is an aesthetic experience to the core and is to be carefully distinguished from raw personal emotion familiar to all in life. Vālmīki did not have the worldly and personal emotion of sorrow, when he saw the surviving bird crying piteously and wallowing in the blood of its mate just killed down by the hunter. In that case he would have just wept and acted like any one of us and not composed a rhythmic verse.<sup>4</sup> We thus come to the conclusion that *rasa* in poetry is *alaukika* or something quite unique impersonal and super-normal; something all sweet and beautiful, an end in itself, aesthetically satisfying.

---

4. cf. "This intense constructiveness of vision goes beyond objects of physical sight. In Blake's much quoted words 'It can see the world in a grain of sand and Heaven in a wild flower.' But however sombre the theme it brings to the artist no grief in the usual sense of the word. For grief disables, but this kind of vision empowers. It has been said that God is a person who feels all the pain there is in the world without being disabled by it at all. And thus much of divineness there is in a great artist." C.E. Montague, *A Writer's Notes on his Trade*, p. 189. Penguin Books, London, 1930.

Dr. SIDDHESHWAR VARMA

## PURPOSE – PHILOSOPHICAL AND GRAMMATICAL – IN INDIAN TRADITION

### 1. Introductory

'Purpose' was an important pivot in which all Indian academic activity vary so closely. It was not only closely associated with the pursuit of the Ancient Indo-Aryan established four objects of life, but also with many philosophical and grammatical contexts.

### 2. 'Purpose' in philosophical contexts

Purpose was diversely treated in various schools of Indian Philosophy, some of which may be noticed as follows :

#### (a) *Purpose and object*

In the Nyāya School, Vātsyāyana, in his introduction to Gautama 1.1.1, defines purpose (*prayojana*) as that urged by which one is activated.<sup>1</sup> But the pivot of the urge was to be some object which was either desired or avoided.<sup>2</sup> He adds that this purpose pervades all living beings, all activities and all sciences,<sup>3</sup> and it is on this purpose that logic (= examination of objects by proofs) depends.

#### (b) *Purpose and action*

According to Gautama, purpose is that with an eye to which one proceeds to act;<sup>4</sup> thus a man collects fuel for the purpose of cooking his food. Vātsyāyana states in this connection that when one acts with an intention, either to attain or to avoid some object, then that intention is called purpose,<sup>5</sup> as it is a cause of action.

1. *yam artham adhikṛtya pravartate tat prayojanam*, *Nyāya-sūtra* (NS), 1.1.24.

2. *yam artham abhīpsan jihāsan vā karmārabhate*, on NS. 1.1.1.

3. *tenānena sarve prāṇīnaḥ sarvāṇi karmāṇi sarvāś ca vidyā vyāptāḥ*, *ibid.*

4. *tadāśrayaś ca nyāyaḥ pravartate. kaḥ punar ayam nyāyaḥ ? pramāṇair artha-parikṣaṇam nyāyaḥ*, *ibid.*

5. NS 1.1.24. See note 1 above.

6. See note 2 above.

(c) *Determinants of purpose*

What produces purpose? According to the author of the *Nyāya-vārtika*, some say that the four ideals of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa* drive people to action<sup>7</sup>, but according to the author of the *Nyāyakośa*, it is for attainment of happiness or avoidance of pain that living beings act<sup>8</sup>. The *Tarkapradīpikā* ultimately traces purpose to desire – desire either to attain or to avoid something.<sup>9</sup>

(d) *Ideals of purpose*

Some authorities have formulated diverse ideals of purpose, e.g., freedom from any condition whatsoever<sup>10</sup>, and independence of others' desires.

3. **Various aspects of purpose according to the Vedānta School**

The Vedānta School has studied purpose from various points of view –

(a) *Purpose, its close connection with knowledge*

According to the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*<sup>11</sup>, purpose is that, which, if known, is desired to be known. This view evidently neglects those objects, as a serpent, which we know, but which we cannot desire.

(b) *Purpose as an idealized concept*

Purpose, according to the Vedānta school, is twofold, primary and secondary. Primary purpose<sup>12</sup> is that which is above pain and pleasure, while the commentary *Sikhāmaṇi* further defines primary purpose as that which is free<sup>13</sup> from any conditional stage like *Dharma*.

The primary purpose includes the retention of that which is already attained, namely 'supreme self-realization'.<sup>14</sup>

4. **True purpose identified with immediate knowledge**

Another feature of purpose, according to the Vedānta school, is immediate knowledge,<sup>15</sup> i.e. knowledge not dependent upon any book or word.

7 *atra vārttikakārā āhuḥ, dharmārthakāmamokṣaiaḥ prayujyate iti kecit*, Quoted by *Nyāyakośa*, p. 572.

8 *vayaṁ tu paśyāmaḥ, sukhaduḥkḥāptihānibhyāṁ prayujyate iti*, ib'd. p. 572.

9 *sādhya-tayecchāviśayaḥ, yathā sukhaṁ duḥkhaḥānīś ca prayojanam*, ibid. p. 572.

10 (a) *prayojanasya mukhyatvaṁ nirupādhi-ccchāviśayatvam*,

(b) *itarecchānedhīnecchāviśayatvam*, Works like *Citsukhi* quoted by *Nyāyakośa*, p. 572.

11 *yad avagataṁ sat svavṛttitayeṣyate tat prayojanam*, Dharmarāja: *Vedāntaparibhāṣā*, p. 406, Bombay, S. 1968.

12 *sukhaduḥkḥābhāvau mukhye prayojane*, ibid.

13 *tan mukhyam prayojanam atiriktadharmajñānāpekṣam iṣyamāṇaṁ gaṇam ity arthaḥ*, ibid.

14 *loke api prāptapṛāpti-parihṛta-parihārayoḥ prayojanatvaṁ dṛṣṭam*, ibid.  
*mokṣo nāpyaḥ kiṁ tu āptah* — Śāṅkara.

### 5. Purpose realized only with the sensing of knowledge

All real knowledge can be only sensed,<sup>16</sup> direct perception being denied to Logos or *Śabda*<sup>16</sup>. Consequently intuitional knowledge is called 'immediate perception' (*mānasa-pratyakṣa*)<sup>17</sup>.

### 6. Conclusion

We notice in the philosophical data mentioned above, two types of concepts of purpose, namely realistic, as represented by the Nyāya, and idealistic, as proclaimed by the Vedānta school. The former view, it is hoped, will be more acceptable.

### 7. Concept of 'purpose' in the grammatical sense

The concept of 'purpose' in the grammatical sense is embedded in a number of words used in connection with the dative case, particularly in the word *abhipraiti* 'intends' used by Pāṇini in I. iv. 32. It is from the grammatical commentators that we can get some idea of the sense of purpose used grammatically.

### 8. Purpose and Pāṇini

According to Pāṇini,<sup>18</sup> the grammatical dative is that which the agent purposes by action. That Pāṇini's view of dative, although obviously pragmatic by his use of the word *karaṇa* in the *sūtra* concerned, was basically concentrated on Purpose, is manifestly indicated by his explicit use of *abhipraiti*, 'purposes'. This concept of 'purpose', as intended by Pāṇini, has been thus explained by Patañjali.<sup>19</sup> In Pāṇini's *abhipraiti*, the prefix *abhi* signifies 'keeping in view', the other prefix *pra* signifies 'the original action representing all the succeeding actions secondarily performed in connection with the main action'.

### 9. Purpose defined by the posterior followers of Pāṇini

While the posterior grammatical work *Bhūṣaṇa*<sup>20</sup> defines 'purpose' to be the basic concept underlying the dative case, this purpose has been defined diversely from two points of view by the commentary *Prabhā*; purpose, according to this work is (a) the object of that desire which is indicated by the point of the action implied by the meanings of

- 
15. *indriya-janyatvaṃ jñānānām pratyakṣatvaṃ ity arthaḥ = karaṇa-nibandhanam eva jñānānām pratyakṣatvaṃ na viśaya-viśeṣa-nibandhanam*, ibid.
  16. *samvit-sākṣārtve indriyajanyatvasyaiva proyojakatayā na śabda-janya-jñānasyā-parokṣatvaṃ*, ibid.
  17. *śāstra-dṛṣṭi-sūtram api brahmaviśaya-mānasopratyakṣasya śāstra-prayojyatvād upapadyate*, ibid. p. 416.
  18. *karmaṇā yaṃ abhipraiti sa sampradānam*, Pāṇini, I. iv. 32.
  19. *abhir ābhimukhye vartate praśabda ādikarmaṇi, tena yaṃ cābhipraiti, yaṃ cābhi-praiśyati, yaṃ cābhiprāgād ābhimukhyamūtre sarvatra siddham bhavati*, on Pāṇini, I. iv. 32.
  20. *uddeśyaś ca caturthyarthah, Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra*, p. 213, Benares, S. 2004.

various verbs<sup>21</sup>, (b) the object of that desire which is the basis of fruit generated by the action associated therewith<sup>22</sup>. According to the former interpretation, the determinant of the purpose is the fruit. According to the latter, it is the desire itself. It may be presumed that the latter view, being more basic psychologically, will be acceptable. The commentary, *Prabhā* explains that the thing given may be fair in certain contexts. Thus in the phrase: 'the teacher gives a slap to the pupil', the pupil is the basis of the fruit of action generated by desire.<sup>23</sup>

#### 10. The seat of purpose : a specific allotment

Where does this purpose lie? According to Nāgeśa,<sup>24</sup> in the utterance *viprāya gām dadāti* the giving implies a purpose existing in that particular giving which concerns the Brahmin, that is to say, a specifically allotted giving.

#### 11. Purpose indirectly connected with the fruit : Gadādhara's view

According to Gadādhara,<sup>25</sup> in a sentence like *brāhmaṇya gām dadāti*, the object cow is desired because it is the basis or support of the fruit, the *brāhmaṇya* is intended because it is connected with the fruit<sup>26</sup>, so in Pāṇini I. iv. 32 the function of both the cases can be explained.

#### 12. Usage of the Dative in connection with particuler verbs : Gadādhara's view

According to Gadādhara, *yaj* was used in connection with the accusative, but *hu* in connection with the dative. Thus he illustrated : *rudraṃ yajati* but *rudrāya juhoti*. He adds that both the verbs connote the Deity's pleasure; *yaj* suggests a pleasure with a mixture of esteem on the part of the offerer, but *hu* involves no such esteem, it is a mechanical offering.<sup>26</sup>

#### 13. Conclusion

It will be noticed from the above data that according to ancient Indian thought, Purpose was inextricably connected with all activity – instinctive activity was inconceivable to ancient Indian thought. Moreover it was said to be the foundation of all philosophical approach,

21. *uddeśyatvaṃ, tattad-dhātvarthakarma-niṣṭha phala-nirūpakatvenecchā-viśayatvaṃ.*

22. *uddeśyatvaṃ, kriyayā yatkarma tat-sambandha-janya-phalāśrayatvenecchā-viśayatvaṃ.*

23. *viprāya gām dadāti* tyādaṁ viprābhinnasampradāna-niṣṭhoddeśyatānirūpakam dānam iti bodhaḥ, *Laghumañjuṣā*, p. 1262.

24. Gadādhara's *Vyutpattivāda*, Bombay, S. 1970.

*phalāśrayatayeṣṭatvaṃ eva hi karmatvaṃ*, *ibid.* p. 449.

25. *phalasambandhitayeṣṭatvaṃ sampradānatvaṃ*, *ibid.* p. 449.

26. *gauravita-prītihetu-kriyā yajyarthah, juhotyutsrjyādeḥ*, *ibid.* pp. 456-457.

while the Vedānta School tried to sanctify purpose by associating to with spiritual self-realization and with all spiritual effort to escape the stage of pain and pleasure.

The grammatical school, being more pragmatic, could not be so universal in its outlook. But even it ultimately traced purpose to human desire — desire to avoid pain and get pleasure. So here we find a point of convergence common to ancient Indian philosophy and grammar.

The question of usage in connection with the dative had begun to interest Sanskrit Grammatical thinkers, but no systematic investigation of usage in human speech was ever made.





SRI JAGANNATH AGRAWAL

## GLIMPSES OF PĀṬALIPUTRA IN THE GUPTA AGE

The eye-witness's account of the Indian metropolis by the Greek ambassador Megasthenese is quite well-known to the students of Indian history. However we have been confronted with an utter paucity of information regarding this capital city of India, in the later period particularly during the glorious regime of the Guptas. The description given by Fahien is scrappy, and by the time of Hiuen Tsang's visit the capital was already in ruins. The well-known works of Sanskrit literature do not contain any thing more than a mere mention of the name. Thus, we had, practically no source of information which could throw some light on the grandeur and pomp of the capital of the Gupta empire. Quite unexpectedly, a flood of light has been thrown by two monologue plays in Sanskrit, the *Ubhayābhisārikā* of Vararuci and *Dhūrtavīṭasamvāda* of Īśvaradatta, which had remained in oblivion for a long time. The manuscript containing these plays was discovered and published in 1922 by M. Ramakrishna Kavi and S.K. Ramanatha Sastri, under the title *Caturbhāṣī*,<sup>1</sup> as the number of *Bhāṣas* (monologues) in the manuscript discovered by them was four. An anonymous verse found at the end of one of the *Bhāṣas*, describes the talent of their authors as far superior to that of Kālidāsa<sup>2</sup>. The language of these plays is so sweet and so fluent that it has been described as the ambrosia of Sanskrit prose by such an eminent authority as the late Prof. F.W. Thomas of Oxford.<sup>3</sup> The internal evidence of the plays makes it apparent that they were written at a time when the people vividly remembered the prosperous rule of Kumāragupta I.

The two *Bhāṣas* named above, contain some very vivid pictures of the great metropolis of the Guptas and afford quite a few glimpses of

1. A much improved and annotated edition has been brought out by Drs. Moti Chandra and V.S. Agrawala.
2. *vararucir īśvaradattaḥ śyāmīlakaḥ śūdrakaś ca catvāraḥ |  
ete bhāṣāṇaḥ babhanuḥ kṛtṛ śaktiḥ kālidāsaśya ||*
3. Centenary supplement to JRAS, 1924, 36; JRAS, 1924, 262 ff.

the gay and colourful life in this capital city. The *Ubhayābhisārikā* contains the following charming description :-

“*aho ! kusumapurarājamārgasya parā śrīḥ. iha hi, susiktasam nṛṣṭoc-  
cāvacakusumopahārā anyagrḥāṇāṃ vāsagrḥāyante ratthyiḥ nānāvidhā-  
nām paṇyasamudāyānāṃ krayavikrayavyāpṛtajanena śobhante 'ntarāpāṇa-  
mukhāni. brahmodāharaṇa-saṃgīta-dhanurjyāghoṣair anyonyam abhi-  
vyāharantiḥ dāśamukhavadanānīva prāsādapaṅktayaḥ kvacid udghā-  
ṭitagavākṣeṣu prāsādamegheṣu rathyāvalokanakutūhalā śobhante pramadā-  
vidyutaḥ kailāsaparvaiāntargatāḥ ivāpsarasah. api ca pravarahaya-  
gajarathagatā itastataḥ paricalantaḥ śobhante mahāmāīramukyāḥ. taru-  
ṇajanayanamanoharaṇasamarthāś cārulilāḥ sthānavinyasthabhūṣaṇāḥ  
suranagarayuvaiśriyam apahasantiyaḥ paricaranti preṣayuvataḥ sarva-  
janayanabhramarair āpiyamānamukhakamalaśobhā rathyānugrahartham  
iva pādapracāralilām anubhavanti gaṇikā dārikāḥ. kim bahunā,*

*sarvair vitabhayaḥ prahrṣṭavadanair nityotsavavyāpṛtaiḥ  
śrīmadratnavibhūṣaṇāṅgaracanaḥ sraggandhavastrojvalaiḥ /  
kriḍāsaukhyaparāyaṇair viracitaprakhyātānāṅgunair  
bhūmīḥ pāṭaliputracārutilakā svargāyate sāmpratam ||*

“Oh wonderful ! This transcendent beauty of the royal-road of Kusu-  
mapura. Here indeed the streets which are exceedingly well swept and  
sprinkled and have been proffered flowers of different varieties, look like  
the bed-chambers<sup>4</sup> of houses of other places. The entrances (of the shops)  
in the interior of the market look fine with the people busy in the purchase  
and sale of commercial stores of various kinds. The rows of mansions  
resounding with the recitation of the sacred hymns, the notes of musi-  
cal concerts, and the twanging of the bow-string, look as if speaking  
to each other, like the mouths of Rāvaṇa. In some places young ladies  
of infatuating beauty, who have opened the windows of their mansions  
out of a curiosity to have glimpse of the street, look splendid like the  
flashes of lightning in a cloud and are a match for the divine damsels  
occupying the mountain Kailāsa. The Chief Officers riding on excellent  
horses, elephants and chariots moving to and fro add to the beauty of  
the scene. Young maid servants having charming sportive movements,  
and putting on ornaments at the right positions, and capable of attrac-  
ting the eyes and minds of young men, mocking at the beauty of the  
excellent damsels of the city of the gods are going about. The grown  
up daughters of the hetaera, the beauty of whose lotus like faces is  
being gulped in by the black bees in the form of the eyes of all people,  
are enjoying a stroll as if to bestow a favour on the street. In short,  
This land (comparable to a lady) having the charming forehead mark

4. Motichandra and V S. Agrawala, *Śṛṅgārahāṭa*, 124-125.

5. *Vāsagrha* is the best decorated room in the house.

in the form of Pāṭaliputra, is a veritable heaven. Here all the people are free from fear, having joyful faces, and are constantly engaged in festivities. Their bodies are adorned with resplendent jewels, and they look bright with the garlands, scent and raiment. They are prone to a life of sport and pleasure and their various fine qualities are framed afar.

In the foregoing description, not only do we get an account of scrupulously clean and neat roads of Pāṭaliputra bedecked with flowers, its high mansions, its markets with their abundant stores of all commodities, but the writer has also graphically painted the gay and rich life of the people who knew no worries or hardships and were the fortunate citizens of a rich and prosperous state.

The second of the *Bhāṣas*, the *Dhūrtaviṭasaṃvāda* of Īśvaradatta, speaks of Pāṭaliputra as the city *par excellence*. Its account runs as follows :

*'sthāne khalu kusumapurasyānanyanagarasadr̥ṣi nagaram ity aviśeṣa-grāhiṇi pṛthivyām sthitā kirtih bahūnt khalv asya purasya gṛhāṇy ucchrāyavanti paṇyasamudāyāj janabāhulyāc ca tāṃsīān smṛddhivīśeṣān dṛṣṭvā vismayate janaḥ-tatra ko vismayaḥ. santi hy anyāny api smṛddhimanti purāṇi. ye tv asya nissādhārāṇā guṇās tān vakṣyāmaḥ. tathā hi-*

*dātāraḥ sulabhāḥ kalā bahumatā dākṣiṇyabhogyāḥ striyo nonmatā dhanino na matsarayutā vidyāvinīṭā narāḥ | sarvaḥ śiṣṭakathaḥ parasparaguṇagrāhi kṛtājñō janaḥ śakyam bhiḥ nagare suraḥ api divaṃ saṃtyajya lubdhaṃ sukham.\* ||*

"Kusumapura, has rightly established on this earth, its fame which is not shared by any other city – on account of which its mere mention as the city (*nagara*) without the addition of any qualifying epithet (conveys the idea). Many indeed are its houses (adorned with) lofty pillars. People are struck with wonder on seeing the various aspects of its prosperity revealed by the huge quantities of the commercial goods and the crowds of people. But what is there to feel surprised? There are other prosperous cities too. Indeed, we shall describe those of its characteristics which are unique.

"It is easy to find charitably disposed persons. Fine arts are highly valued. Women are treated with chivalry. The rich are not intoxicated. The people though highly educated are free from jealousy."

6. Motichandra and V.S. Agrawala, *Śṛṅgārāḥṭa*, 69-70.

7. Compare how Bhartṛhari complains of the jealousy of the learned critics when he says *boddhāro matsaragrastāḥ*.

Every one speaks in a cultured manner. People appreciate each others merits and are grateful. My friend, it is possible even for the gods to find happiness in Pāṭaliputra, having given up the heaven".

The foregoing extracts paint a vivid picture of this city *par excellence*. The neat and clean roads seem to have been a marked feature as we find repeated references to the same. Besides what has been said above, we find one more statement to the same effect, namely 'it was not necessary to wash the feet after a walk on the roads of Pāṭaliputra, which excell even the terraces of mansions'.<sup>8</sup> How the surging crowds of people jostling about in the streets, behave in a most cultured manner is described as follows :

*ayaṃ hi tāvad atyākīrṇajanatayā prakīrṇavicivālaya iva salilanidhiḥ  
subhīmadarśano 'sukho 'vagāhituṃ kusumapurarājamārgaḥ iha hi,  
yo mām paśyati satvaro 'pi na kathām cchṛtvā prayāty anyataḥ  
sambādhe 'pi dadāti cūtarām asau sarvaḥ prahr̥ṣṭo janaḥ |  
kaścin nāticiraṃ vilambayati mām kāryātyayāsāṅkayā  
lokaññāñ puruṣair aho puravarasyāptam yaśo lakṣyate<sup>9</sup> ||*

"This high-street of Kusumapura is very difficult to pass through on account of being too much crowded by people, and looking agreeably grand, like the ocean with a circle of spreading waves, difficult to cross, and looking frightful. Here, indeed, he who sees me, although in a hurry, does not go away (suddenly) breaking up the conversation. Even in the crowd he makes room for me. All people look cheerful. Nobody detains me for long, (thinking) I may be on an urgent errand. The ample fame of this excellent city is visible through its people who are adepts in worldly ways".

In this manner the two Sanskrit monologues, not only present a picture of the city, but also throw welcome light on the high culture of its inhabitants. It was perhaps for this reason that Pāṭaliputra was known in common parlance as the city (*nagara*) and has been so referred to by Vātsyāyana the author of the *Kāmasūtra*.

8. *kusumapurarājamārgo niṣpañkatayā harmyatalāny api atīṣete, Śrngārahāṭa*, p. 89.

9. *ibid.* 74-75.

SRI D. SATYANARAYANA

ARE ĀNANDĀNUBHAVA AND GAṄGĀPURĪ  
BHAṬṬĀRAKA IDENTICAL ?

I. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* enters Ānandānubhava and Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka as two different key entries and does not make any reference to their identity. In a note albeit on commentator the editor adds: ‘*Tātparyadīpikā* on *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* of Ānandānubhava’ thereby making Gaṅgāpurī to be the author of the *Tātparyadīpikā*, a commentary on the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*. The learned editor also refers to the English introduction of *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jain Bhandars* at Pattan compiled from the Notes of C D. Dalal by Lalchandra Bhagawandas Gandhi. The relevant portion reads as follows :

“*Padārthatattvatātparya-dīpikā* by Ānandānubhava, pupil of Nārāyaṇa Jyoti with the commentary *Mitākṣarā* otherwise called *Gaṅgāpurī*”.<sup>1</sup>

In the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* under the caption Ānandānubhava two entries are given. a) Ānandānubhava the author of 1) *Iṣṭasiddhivivaraṇa*, 2) *Nyāyaraṇadīpāvalī* and 3) *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*. b) Ānandānubhava: 1) *Nyāyasāraṭippaṇa*, 2) *Nyāyakalānidhi*-a commentary on Bhāsarvajña, 3) *Rasādīpikā* and 4) *Vedāntacandrikā*. The learned editor justified his entries by stating that this author b) was a disciple of Ananyānubhava and different from the author of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*.

II. Dasgupta also maintains two different entries under the names of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and Ānandānubhava. He states :

“Thus Ānandapūrṇa (A D. 1600) who commented on Śrīharṣa’s *Khaṇḍanakhāṇḍakhāḍya* wrote the *Nyāyacandrikā* in four chapters refuting the views of Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā and Vaiśeṣika. Ānandānubhava

pupil of Nārāyaṇa Jyoti who lived probably in the same century wrote a similar work called *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*".<sup>2</sup> Again he adds—

"It is probable that Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka also lived earlier than Ānandabodha as Citsukha points out, must have then lived either towards the later part of the tenth century or the first part of the eleventh century. It is not improbable that he may have been a senior contemporary of Ānandabodha. His work *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* was commented upon by Ānandajñāna".<sup>3</sup>

It is a fact that Ānandajñāna has commented upon the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and the manuscripts of the commentary are available at various Manuscripts Libraries.

The *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha* of Appayya Dīkṣita quotes the views of the *Padārthatattvanirṇayakāra* as a representative of causation theory of a new Advaitic subschool, wherein both Māyā and Brahman taken together are the material cause of the universe.<sup>4</sup>

Suryanarayanasastry in a note on the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* adds further information as follows :

"*Padārthatattvanirṇaya* by Anandānubhava, disciple of Nārāyaṇa Jyoti attributed by Dasgupta to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka second half of the tenth century or first half of the eleventh century".

Tripathi in his edition of *Tarkasamgraha* by Ānandajñāna attributes authorship of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka.

Gaṅgādharendrasarasvatī in his *Advaitavedāntasūktimañjarī* prefers to call *tattvanirṇayakṛmatam*.<sup>5</sup> The Sarasvatī Bhavan Library of the Varanaseya Sanskrit Viswavidyalaya, Varanasi enters both the *Padārthanirṇaya* manuscripts (Nos 30159 and 31777) under the name of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka. Both the manuscripts are incomplete and there is no colophon to ascertain the authorship. But in the manuscript bearing No. 30159 the name Gaṅgāpurī is written on the first folio and the letters ग. पु. are repeated in each folio suggesting that on expansion these letters mean Gaṅgāpurī.

2. *The History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. II, p. 57, l. 16 in fn.

3. *ibid.* p. 50.

4. अत्राहुः पदार्थतत्त्वनिर्णयकाराः ब्रह्ममाया चेत्युभयमुपादानमित्युभयश्रुत्युपपत्तिः, सत्ताजाड्य-  
रूपोभयधर्मानुगव्युपपत्तिश्च । तत्र ब्रह्म विवर्तमानतयोपादानम्, अविद्या परिणममानतया ।  
*Acyutagranthamālā*, p. 74.

5. अहेतुत्वादमायस्य मायाशब्दलेख्यते ।

साप्युपादानमेवेति तत्त्वनिर्णयकृन्मतम् ॥ 1.24.

Now let us consider about the other work of the author, i.e. *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* which has also been commented upon by Ānandajñāna.

The *Nayanaprasādini* of Pratyaksvarūpa Bhagavān a commentary on the *Tattvapradīpikā* of Citsukha has referred once the name of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and twelve times the name of *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali*. The *Bhāvadyotanikā* of Sukhaprakāśamuni another commentary has also referred to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* at sixteen places.<sup>6</sup>

There is no doubt that the author of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* is the same. The Author of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* has mentioned his other two works there, i.e. the *Nyāyaratnapīḍāvali* and *Iṣṭasiddhivivaraṇa*. In the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* also he has made a reference to *Iṣṭasiddhivivaraṇa*. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* states that Prof. Hiriyanṇa in his edition of *Iṣṭasiddhi* traces passages common between *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* and *Iṣṭasiddhivivaraṇa* but nothing of that sort cou'd be found out in the edition published as 65 of GOS.

The colophons of all these manuscripts read the author as Ānandānubhava, disciple of Nārāyaṇa Jyoti but some manuscripts have ॥ ॐ. superscribed at the title and the opening folio.

The theory of *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* as summarised by Dasgupta in his *History of Indian Philosophy*, (vol. II, pp. 50-51) does belong to the text of *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*. As a matter of fact Dasgupta has quoted the passage from the *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha* which gives the views of *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and not from the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*. It reads :

"His (Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka's) work *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* was commented upon by Ānandajñāna. According to him both Brahma and Māyā are to be regarded as the cause of the world. All kinds of world phenomena exist and being may therefore be attributed to them; and being is the same whatever may be the nature of things that exist. Brahman is thus the changeless cause in the world or the *vivarta-kāraṇa*; but all the changing contents or individual existents must also be regarded as products of the transformation of some substance and in this sense Māyā is to be regarded as the *Pariṇāmi-kāraṇa* of the world. Thus the world has Brahman as its *vivarta-kāraṇa* and Māyā as its *pariṇāmi-kāraṇa*. The world manifests both aspects, the aspect of changeless being and that of changing materiality; so both Māyā and Brahman form the material cause of the world in two different ways

6. cf. pp. 5, 7, 38, 43, 51, 53, 55, 59, 71, 78, 79, 80, 87, 87, 244, in MT. 5203.

(*brahmamāyācetyubhayopādānam; sattvajāḍya-rūpobhaya-dharmānugaty upapattiś ca*). *Tarkaviveka* and *Siddhāntaviveka* are the names of two chapters of this book giving a summary of Vaiśeṣika and Vedānta philosophy respectively. The view of Gaṅgāpurī in the *Padārthātattva-nirṇaya* just referred to seems to have been definitely rejected by Ānandabodha in his *Pramāṇamālā*, p. 16".

Āśutoṣaśāstri in his book *Vedāntadarśana-Advaitavāda* (vol. I, p. 271) maintains Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka to be the author of *Padārthātattvanirṇaya* possibly on the strength of Dasgupta's authority.

The *Pramāṇamālā's* criticism of joint causality is not of much help in ascertaining the authorship. The *Nayanaprasādinī* a commentary on *Citsukhī* has quoted the name of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka or to be precise ascribed a view to him though not named in the text. Let us compare the relevant text in the *Nayanaprasādinī* as also in the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī*.

अत्र गंगापुरीभट्टारकोदीरितदूषणमनुवदति -  
ननु किमिदमित्यादिना ।

The relevant text referred to in the *Citsukhī* reads as follows :

ननु किमिदं साध्यमानं वेद्यत्वं वास्तवम् ? किं वास्तवं दृश्यत्वम् साध्यं किं  
उत्तावास्तवम् ? आहोस्विद्व्यावहारिकम् ? अथवा वाऽवास्तवम्, आद्ये साध्यशून्यो  
साधारणम् ? आद्ये साध्यविकलं निदर्शन- दृष्टान्तः । इतरयोस्तु सिद्धसाधनता ।  
मितरेषु सिद्धसाधनत्वमिति ।

The two passages read almost like identical passages. There is no reason to disbelieve the passage referred to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and found in the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* of Ānandānubhava is the passage meant by the author of *Tattvapradīpikā* (TP).

There are a few more passages referred to as belonging to *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* (NRD) or *Ratnadīpāvalī* or *Nyāyadīpāvalī*.

- 
7. *Nayanaprasādinī*, pp. 13-14. Edited with Hindi translation by Yogendranandaji, Varanasi.
  8. *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī*, p. 116. Published by Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library No. CLXVI.



They are as follows :-

*Tattvapradīpikā*

१. अनुभूतिः अनुभूतिव्यवहारहेतुप्रकाशोऽनुभूतित्वात्, यन्नैवं तन्नैवं यथा घट इत्यनुमानं प्रमाणम् । न चाप्रसिद्ध-विशेषणः पक्षः, अनुभूति व्यवहारस्य हेतुभूतः प्रकाशः परेषामपि हि प्रसिद्धः ततोऽनुभूतेस्तत्स्वरूपत्वप्रतिज्ञोपपद्यते । न चानुव्यवसायज्ञाने साध्यस्य सिद्धत्वाद् भागे सिद्धसाधनता, तत्स्वरूपस्यैवासंमतत्वेन तस्य धर्मिभागतानङ्गीकारात् इति ।<sup>9</sup>

२. ननुभयसंमतायथार्थव्यवहारे हेतुज्ञानमात्र-पक्षोकरणादुभयपरिहार इति गंगापुरीयं मतं शङ्कते — अयथार्थेति ।

अयथार्थव्यवहारहेतोर्ज्ञानस्य पक्षी-करणाददोष इति चेत् ।<sup>11</sup>

३. सत्त्वासत्त्वयोस्तु ख्यातिबाधप्रयोजकतायां लाघवमिति चेत्, मैवम्, तवापि व्यतिरेके गौरवस्य तुल्यत्वात् । अख्यात्य-बाध्यत्वयोः सदसद्वैलक्षण्यस्य प्रयोज-कत्वाङ्गीकारात् ।<sup>13</sup>

*Nyāyaratnadīpāvali*

स्वव्यवहारहेतुः प्रकाशः, संवित्त्वात् कुम्भवदिति व्यतिरेकी । न तावद-प्रसिद्धविशेषणता । संविद् व्यवहारहेतुप्रकाशो हि प्रसिद्धः । अतः तत्स्वरूपत्वं साध्यं नाप्रसिद्धम् । संवित्प्रकाशभागे सिद्धसाधनमिति चेन्न । तस्या धर्मिभागत्वात् । संवित्प्रकाशो ह्यसंप्रतिपन्नो न प्रकृतिविवाद-पदम् । अतो न धर्मी, न भागे सिद्ध-साधनता ।<sup>10</sup>

अयथार्थव्यवहारहेतोर्ज्ञानस्य धर्मित्वेऽविरोधात् ।<sup>12</sup>

विमतमनिर्वचनीयं भ्रमविषयत्वात् वाध्यत्वात् वा कुम्भवदिति व्यतिरेकी प्रयोगोऽत्र सम्भवतीति चेन्न, परस्या-प्रसिद्धविशेषणत्वात् । सदसतोः परस्परं वैलक्षण्यं प्रसिद्धम् ।<sup>14</sup>

विमतं .....<sup>15</sup>

9. *Citsukhī* (TP), p. 10.

10. *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* (NRD), p. 117.

11. TP, p. 106.

12. NRD, p. 152.

13. TP, p. 141.

14. NRD, p. 175.

15. *ibid.* p. 177.

सदसतोर्हि प्रत्येकं प्रतियोगित्वमत्र  
वैलक्षण्ये विवक्षितम् ।<sup>16</sup>

४. यत्तु कैश्चिदुच्यते कार्यान्वयान्वयिनि इत्यत्र  
किं कार्यं विशेषणमन्वयस्य, किं वोप-  
लक्षणम् ? नाद्यः, अन्वयस्य कार्य-  
विशिष्टस्य संबन्धद्वयप्रसङ्गात् । युगपच्च  
कार्यान्वययोर्विशेषणता विशेष्यता चाप-  
द्येत । न चैतत्सर्वमुपपन्नम् । अलौकि-  
कत्वात् । नापि द्वितीयः । कार्यस्य  
शब्दशक्त्यगोचरप्रसङ्गात् इति ।<sup>17</sup>

५. प्रकृष्टप्रकाश इति वाक्यं चन्द्रप्राति-  
पदिकमात्रार्थस्तत्प्रश्नोत्तरार्थत्वात् ।<sup>19</sup>

६. प्रामाण्यं ज्ञानहेतुमात्रजन्याश्रयमप्रामाण्ये-  
तरत्वे सति ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वात् ज्ञानत्ववत् ।  
दोषजन्यत्वेन व्यभिचारो मा भूदिति  
ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वादित्युक्तम् । तथा प्रामाण्य-  
मुक्तविधमप्रामाण्येतरत्वे सति ज्ञानत्वन्यून

कार्यान्वयान्विते पदानां.....  
..... । तथाहि किं कार्यं  
विशेषणमन्वयस्य किं वोपलक्षणम् ।  
नाद्यः, अन्वयस्य कार्यविशिष्टस्य  
कार्यान्वये सति कार्यस्य संबन्धद्वय-  
प्रसङ्गात् । युगपच्च कार्यान्वययोर्विशेष-  
णता विशेष्यता चापद्येत । न चैतत्-  
सर्वमुपपन्नम् । अलौकिकत्वात् । तत्  
कल्पने चातिप्रसङ्गात् । तदेवं न  
कार्यं विशेषणान्वयस्य । नापि द्वितीयः  
कल्पः अकार्यस्य शक्तिगोचरप्रसङ्गात् ।<sup>18</sup>

यद्यपि प्रकृष्टप्रकाशश्चन्द्र इति वाक्यं  
चन्द्रस्वरूपमात्रप्रश्नोत्तरम् । तथापि न  
तस्याखण्डार्थता । प्रकर्षगुणवतः प्रका-  
शस्य चन्द्रत्वप्रबोधनात् । कथं गुण-  
विशिष्टार्थं वाक्यं चन्द्रस्वरूपप्रश्नोत्तरं  
भवेत् ।<sup>20</sup>

प्रामाण्यं ज्ञानहेतुमात्रजन्याश्रयम्, अप्रा-  
माण्येतरत्वे सति ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वात्,  
ज्ञानत्ववत् । दोषजन्यत्वेन व्यभिचारो  
मा भूदिति ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वमुक्तम् । तद्धि  
व्याधेरपि धर्मः । तथाप्रामाण्यमुक्त-

16. *ibid.* p. 178.

17. TP. pp. 150-151.

18. NRD. p. 82.

19. TP. p. 190.

20. NRD. p. 140.

वृत्तित्वात् प्रत्यक्षवदित्यनुमानं मानमिति केचित् ।<sup>21</sup>

विधम्, अप्रामाण्येतरत्वेसति ज्ञानत्व-  
न्यूनवृत्तित्वात् प्रत्यक्षत्ववत् ।<sup>22</sup>

७. ननु किं ज्ञानव्यक्तेः प्रमाव्यक्तितोऽस्ति कश्चित् विशेषः, किं वा प्रमाव्यक्तिरेव ज्ञानव्यक्तिः । आद्ये प्रत्यक्षज्ञानव्यक्त्या स्पष्टो व्यभिचारः । प्रत्यक्षज्ञानव्यक्तेर्विज्ञानहेत्वतिरिक्तहेत्वधीनत्वाभावात् द्वितीयेऽपि जन्यापि विज्ञानरूपा प्रमा न ज्ञानहेत्वतिरिक्तहेत्वधीनेति बाध इति ।<sup>23</sup>

तत्रहि किं ज्ञानव्यक्तेः प्रमाव्यक्तितोऽस्ति विशेषः किं वा प्रमाव्यक्तिरेव ज्ञानव्यक्तिः । आद्ये प्रत्यक्षज्ञानव्यक्त्या स्फुटो व्यभिचारः । द्वितीये तु जन्यापि ज्ञानरूपा प्रमा ज्ञानहेत्वधीना न भवतीत्युक्तं भवेत् । अतः स्फुटो बाधः ।<sup>24</sup>

८. ननु प्रमा स्वतो ज्ञायते परनिरपेक्षोत्पत्तिकत्वात् ज्ञानवत् । तथा प्रामाण्यं स्वतो ज्ञायते अप्रामाण्येतरत्वे सति ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वात् ज्ञानत्ववत् इत्यस्त्येवानुमानमिति चेत् ।<sup>25</sup>

प्रमा स्वतो ज्ञायते परनिरपेक्षोत्पत्तिकत्वात् ज्ञानवत् । तथा प्रामाण्यं स्वतो ज्ञायते अप्रामाण्येतरत्वे सति ज्ञानैकधर्मत्वात् ज्ञानत्ववत् ।<sup>26</sup>

९. विपक्षे प्रामाण्ये संशयो न स्यात् ज्ञाननिश्चायकादेव तन्निश्चयप्राप्तेर्बाधकस्तर्कः । ननु नैवमनुमानमुदेति । धर्मिहेत्वोरसिद्धेः । प्रामाण्यं प्रवृत्तिसामर्थ्यालिंगावगम्यं भवद्भिरुपगम्यते । तस्य च लिंगस्य प्रवृत्तिः प्रामाण्ये संशयपूर्विका । असंदिग्धे सिषाधयिषाभावात् अनुमानाप्रवृत्तेः ।<sup>27</sup>

विपक्षे च प्रामाण्य संशयो न स्यादिति बाधः । ज्ञाननिश्चायकादेव तन्निश्चयप्राप्तेः तदपि वार्तम् । धर्मिहेत्वोरसिद्धेः आनुमानिक एव ते प्रामाण्यनिश्चयः तन्निश्चयश्च तत्संशयपूर्वकः अन्यथा सिषाधयिषाभावादनुमानासंभवात् ।<sup>28</sup>

१०. किञ्चेदमन्योन्याश्रयत्वमुत्पत्तौ ज्ञप्तौ वा स्यात् ? नाद्यः । मन्त्रतदभावयोः परस्परं हेतुत्वाभावात् । नापि द्वितीयः । अज्ञा-

अपि चेयमुत्पत्तौ ज्ञप्तौ वा स्यात् । नाद्यः असंभवात् । मन्त्रतदभावयोः परस्परहेतुत्वात् । नापि

21. TP. pp. 205-6.

22. NRD. pp. 43-44.

23. TP. p. 2J7.

24. NRD. pp. 36-37.

25. TP. p. 211.

26. NRD. p. 53.

27. TP. p. 212.

28. NRD. n. 39.

तयोः मन्त्रतदभावयोः कार्यं प्रतिकूलत्व-  
कारणत्वयोरुपपत्तेः । ननु कार्याभावावसेय  
कार्यप्रतिकूलभावा मन्त्रादयः शक्तेरपह-  
वाय कारणाभावाच्च । इष्यन्ते अत एव  
मन्त्राद्यभावोऽपि कारणमिष्यते ततो  
मन्त्रतदभावनिष्ठप्रतिबन्धकत्वकारणत्व-  
योन्योन्योपाधिकत्वादुत्पत्तौ ज्ञसौ  
वान्योन्याश्रयता दुर्वारेति ।<sup>29</sup>

चरमः । अज्ञातयोरेव तयोः तथात्वात् ।  
तदसत् । कार्याभावावसेयोऽपि हि  
प्रतिबन्धः शक्तिनिरपेक्षः त्वया  
कारणाभाव इष्यते । कारणं च तद-  
भावरूपम्, अतो यद्यपि मन्त्रतद-  
भावयोः न परस्परहेतुता तथापि तयोः  
प्रतिबन्धकत्वकारणत्वयोरन्योन्योपाधि-  
कत्वात् उत्पत्तावन्योन्याश्रयता सुस्थि-  
तैव ।<sup>30</sup>

११. अस्तु तर्ह्यग्निरतीन्द्रियसामान्यवन्नि-  
ष्क्रयाश्रयः कारणत्वात् गुरुत्वाश्रयवदिति  
प्रयोगः । तेजो द्व्यणुकमतीन्द्रियरूपस्य  
वायोश्चाधिकरणमिति तद्व्यावृत्त्यर्थमती-  
न्द्रियसामान्यवन्निष्क्रयेत्युक्तम् ।<sup>31</sup>

अग्निरतीन्द्रियसामान्यवन्निष्क्रयाश्रयः  
कारणत्वात् गुरुत्वाश्रयवत् । तेजो द्व्य-  
णुकमतीन्द्रियरूपस्य वायोश्चाधिकरणं  
सिद्धमित्यतीन्द्रियसामान्यवान्निष्क्र-  
येत्युक्तम् ॥<sup>32</sup>

१२. यत्पुनरिह कैश्चिदुच्यते - विमतं शाब्द-  
ज्ञानमपरोक्षविषयत्वात् सुखज्ञानवदिति ।<sup>33</sup>

प्रयोगस्तु विमतं, अपरोक्षम्, अपरोक्ष-  
विषयत्वात् सुखज्ञानवदिति ।<sup>34</sup>

From the parallel passages quoted above it is amply clear that the *Tattvapradīpikā* has reproduced almost *verbatim* in most cases from the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* ascribed to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka. The passages quoted here are all from the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* of Ānandānubhava. This comparison shall leave no doubt in any quarter that references made by the *Tattvapradīpikā* and named by the *Nayanaprasādinī* have been to the same book and to the identical passages. It can now be concluded safely that Citsukha meant Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka to be the author or to be more precise the commentator Pratyagrūpa identified the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* and Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka as its author for Citsukha though Citsukha did not specify the authorship of the views quoted and criticised.

29. TP. p. 229.

30. NRD. pp. 51-52.

31. TP. pp. 231-32.

32. NRD. p. 59.

33. TP. p. 528.

34. NRD. p. 289.

35. *ibid.* p. 12.

Pratyagrūpa Bhagavān the commentator of the commentary *Nayanaprasādinī* on Citsukha's *Tattvapradīpikā* cannot be assigned to a date later than the fifteenth century since a dated manuscript of *Nayanaprasādinī* inscribed as A.D. 1490 is available in the India Office Library. A tradition well prevalent in scholarly circle of the status of the commentator making Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka to be the author of the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* cannot be lightly dismissed.

There is a curious verse in the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* and placed in the text without any context defensible. The verse reads like this :

सारमुद्धरते योऽस्मात् ग्रन्थात् स्तैन्यपरोधमः ।  
तस्य पापमतेर्भूयात् प्रतिजन्माशुभं बहु ॥

The commentator Ānandajñāna has also accepted and recognised the place of this verse by commenting upon it out of context. Thus the verse was incorporated in the text by the author himself at the place where it is found today. What does it lead to? Has the author been anytime a victim of plagiarism?

At page 95 the text *Tattvapradīpikā* reads—

यत्तु कैश्चिदनुमानं रचितम् — न तावदज्ञानं ज्ञानाभावः अभावमानागम्यत्वात्, सम्प्रति-  
पन्नवत् । अभावो ह्यभावस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य वा विषयः परेणेष्ट्यते ; अज्ञानं च न मानगम्यं  
माननिवर्त्यत्वात् संप्रतिपन्नवदिति ।

The corresponding passage in the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* reads as follows :

उच्यते न तावदज्ञानं ज्ञानाभावः अभावमानागम्यत्वात् संप्रतिपन्नवत् । अभावो ह्यभा-  
वस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य वा विषयः परैरिष्यते । अज्ञानं च न मानगम्यं माननिवर्त्यत्वात् ।  
निवर्तकादन्यगम्यं स्यादिति ।

But the commentator Pratyagrūpa Bhagavān has misled. Introducing this sentence to comment upon he adds न्यासकारकृतमनुमानमुद्भावंयति and the learned editor Swami Yogindrananda believes it to be a work of Rāmānujamata<sup>36</sup>. This poses a question. Can we suspect the dependability of the commentator on the naming of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka though it is not the only source to believe Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka as the author.

Appaya Dīkṣita has quoted the views of *Padārthatattvanirṇaya*. The time of Appaya Dīkṣita is accepted generally to be between A.D. 1520–1593 and by that time the author of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* might have earned a claim for inclusion of views in work like the *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha*. Appaya Dīkṣita has not mentioned the name but says *Padārthatattvanirṇayakāraḥ*. It can be inferred that he wanted to avoid the name. It might be that the authorship might have already entered into a frame of questionability. Since the commentator on the *Citsukhi* also belongs to the same period or earlier contemporary the riddle seems to be more intriguing.

Two generalisations can be hazarded. The manuscripts of the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* having upto *Pūrvapakṣa-pariccheda* or the first chapter have the name of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and the manuscripts that are complete and have the colophon read Ānandānubhava as the author. In the North Indian manuscripts libraries mostly the manuscripts are incomplete; hence the name Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka as the author. Is there any chance to suggest that the *Pūrvapakṣa* portion, i.e. the first chapter was the work of Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and the second or the *Siddhānta-pariccheda* was written by Ānandānubhava. This suggestion on the face of it, cannot be maintained since the authorship of both the books, i.e. the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* is assigned to both

The *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* on the causality of Brahman as referred to by the *Siddhāntaleśasamgraha* reads as follows :

ब्रह्मोपादानमितीष्यत एव । न मायोपादानमिति तु न क्षम्यते । उपादानता हि स्वात्मनि कार्यजनितेतुत्वम् । तच्चोभयत्रापि मानसिद्धमुपपन्नं च । तथा हि विश्वस्य मायापरिणामत्वात् मायाश्रयं जन्म । तथा च ब्रह्मविवर्तत्वात् विश्वस्य ब्रह्माधिष्ठानता श्रुता उपपन्ना च ।

The *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* reads on the same topic as follows :

ननु तवापि मायावादिनो मायैवोपादानं न त्वविक्रियं ब्रह्म । अतस्तवाप्युक्तानुपपत्तिस्तुल्येति न । तस्येन्द्रजालकुशलस्यैव माययोपादानत्वोपपत्तेः । तथा च शास्त्रम् — ‘इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयत’ इति ‘मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्’ इति चामुमर्थं बोधयति ।

The commentator Ānandajñāna commenting on both the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* has not added any further light to this statement nor drawn parallel although the basic contribution of the author to the Advaita philosophy is to bring Māyā to a constituent status along with Brahman to be the cause of this universe. The commentary reads :

मायाद्वारा ब्रह्म कारणम् इत्यत्र श्रुतिं प्रमाणयति ।

Naturally the views of (a) *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* and *Nyāyaratna-dīpāvali* are identical; (b) the *Padārthatattvanirṇaya* naming *Nyāyaratna-dīpāvali* and *Iṣṭasiddhivivarāṇa* as the works of the same author; (c) the quotations and views ascribed to Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka and *Nyāyaratna-dīpāvali* having found out in the text of the *Nyāyaratnadīpāvali* printed under the name of Ānandānubhava it is safe to conclude that Ānandānubhava and Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka are identical.





SRI SADHU RAM

## ELLORA PLATES OF DANTIDURGA

Śaka Year 663 (A.D. 742)

*Provenance :* Ellora (ancient Elāpura) in Aurangabad District, Hyderabad, Deccan.

*Published in :* S.K. Dikshit, EI. XXV, 25 ff.

*Language :* Sanskrit, in prose except for the benedictory and imprecatory verses.

*Script :* Northern Brāhmī akin to some Valabhi and S. Gujarāt plates. They are inscribed on one side only and joined together with a copper ring with a seal depicting Garuḍa sitting cross-legged.

*Date :* Śaka samvat 663, 13th bright lunar day of Āśvina, Monday (as read by S. K. Dikshit), which is irregular, but corresponds to Śaka 664 expired, namely 17th September A.D. 742. Mirashi read it as 463 and assigned it to Kalachuri era of A.D. 250-51.

*Object :* Grant of Pippalāla village in the district of Candanapurī—eighty-four, to Revādityabhaṭṭa and other *Navasārikā brahmaṇas* by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Dantidurga, son of Indrarāja and grandson of Karkkarāja.

### TEXT

(First Plate)

१. ॐ स्वस्ति [१\*] वदरिकावासकात्समधिगत - पंच-महाशब्द - म -

२. हा - सामन्ताधिति - राष्ट्रकूटान्वय - गोत्रालंकार श्री - कवर्क -

३. राज [स्] तत्पादानुद्धात - परम - माहेश्वर - समधिगत - पंच - म -
  ४. हा - शब्द - महासामन्ताधिपति - श्रीमदिन्द्रराज - [स्तत्\* -] सुत [े\*] मेरु - महीधर -
  ५. गिर (? विजर) - स्थिर - रुचिर - समुन्नते विकसित - यशसि महति स इन्द्र-राज्ञा (राजस्या) -
  ६. न्वये अनेक - चातुर्दन्त - गज - घटाटोप - समर - संघट्ट - ल -
  ७. बध - विजयी (यः) समधिगत - पंच - महाशब्द - महासामन्ताधिपति
  ८. प्री (पृ) शिवी - बल्लभ - खड्गावलोक - श्री - दन्तिदुर्ग - राज्ञः कुशली
  ९. सर्वानेव राज - सामन्त - भोगिक - विषयपति - राष्ट्रकूट - महत्तरा -
  १०. धिकारिकादी [न्\*] समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वो विदितं यथा च मया एल [I\*] पुर -
  ११. व्यवस्थितेन अश्वयुज - शुद्ध-त्रयोदश्यां स्वहस्तेन पादां (दौ) प्रक्षा -
  १२. ल्य परलोकमपेक्षत्वमङ्गोक्त्य (-लोकमपेक्ष्य) महत्फलं च श्रुत्वा चन्दनपुरि -
  १३. चतुराशित्या (रशीत्य) न्तर्गत - पिप्पलालं नाम ग्रामः [ः\*] नवसारि -
  १४. काविनिर्गत - भरद्वा[ज] - सगोत्र तथा [S\*] ध्वर्यु - रेवादित्य -
  १५. भट्टाय तथा माउल तथा [गो] विसरेभ्य [े] गृहेश्वर ती -
- (Second Plate)
१६. र्थ - स्नातेन बलि - चरु - वैश्वदेवामिहोत्रादिकृ (क्रि) यो -
  १७. त्सर्पणार्थं माता-पित्रोरात्मनश्च पुण्य - यशो [S\*] भि -
  १८. त्रि (वृ) द्धये पिप्पलाल - ग्राम [ः\*] प्रतिपादितः यत [ः\*] अ-चाटभट - प्रावेश्य [ः\*] अ -
  १९. भ्यन्तर - सिद्धिक [ः\*] सर्वादान संग्रहाह्यः [ः\*] यतो [S\*] स्म [द्] वंशै (श्यै) रन्यैर्वा भोग - नृ -
  २०. पतिभिः (भावि - नृपति - भोगपतिभिः) नल - वेणु - कदली - साग - संसार - जल-बुद्बुदोमं जीवित -
  २१. मन्त्रार्थ असहायो [S\*] नुमन्तव्य [ः\*] परिपालयितव्यश्च यो वा [S\*] ज्ञा -
  २२. न - तिमिरान्धावृत - मतिराचि (च्छि) न्यादाछि (च्छि) द्यमानं वा [S\*] नु मोदेत स

२३. पंचभिर्महापातकैः[.] संयु [न\*] वतु[।\*] उक्तं च भवगतो (ता) वेदव्यासेन[।\*]  
षष्टि
२४. वर्ष-सहस्राणि स्वर्गि (गर्गे) तिष्ठति भूमिदः । आच्छेता (त्ता) चानुमन्ता च
२५. तान्येव नरके वसे [त्\*] [॥ १] विन्ध्याटवीष्वतोयासु शष्क-कोटर-वासिनः[।\*]
२६. क्रि (कृ)ष्णाहयो हि जायन्ते भूमिदायं हरन्ति ये [॥२\*] बहुभिर्वसु -
२७. धा भुक्ता राजभिः[\*] रगरादिभिः । यस्य यस्य यदा भूमि [स्] तस्य तस्य  
तदा फ -
२८. लं (लम्) [॥३\*] सं ६०० ६३ अश्वयुज शुद्ध-त्रयोदश्यां सोमवारे [।\*]
२९. लिखितमिदं कुक्कुरेन (ण) गवंग [बाब्बा] भिहितेन (?) [।\*]

### TRANSLATION

*Om.* may it be well ! From the royal camp at Badarikā. (There was) the Mahāsāmāntādhīpati, the ornament of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, the illustrious Karkkarāja who had obtained the privilege of enjoying the tunes of five kinds of musical instruments. Favoured by his feet was (his son) the staunch devotee of Maheśvara the Mahāsāmāntādhīpati, the illustrious Indrarāja who had acquired the privilege of enjoying the tunes of five kinds of musical instruments. His son, (born) in the great family of Indrarāja, which is as splendid, stable and imperishable as the mountain Meru, was the Mahāsāmāntādhīpati, the illustrious Dantidurga, bearing the title of *Prīhivī-vallabha* and *Khaḍgā-valoka* and having the privilege of enjoying the tunes of five kinds of musical instruments. He, who had won victory in the battle-affray swarming with countless troops of four tusked elephants, orders in full soundness of his health all the kings, feudatories *bhogikas*, *viṣayapatis*, and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa *Mahattaras* and officials: "May it be known to you that while residing at Elāpura and having regard to the other world and hearing about the great fruit (accruing from charity), I had, on the thirteenth (lunar day) of the bright half of (the month) *Āśvayuja*, bestowed the village named Pippalāla in (the district) Candanapurī-eighty-four, on the *Adhvaryu* Revāditya Bhaṭṭa and Maula and Govisara of *Bhāradvāja-gotra* and hailing from Navasārika, after having bathed in the *Guhēśvara-tīrtha* and washed (their) feet with my own hand, for the purpose of maintaining the performance of the rites of *ball*, *caru*, *vatśvadeva*, *agnihotra* etc., in order to increase the merit and fame of my parents and myself. Whereto (the special privileges) shall be: (i) that it would be out of bounds for the irregular and regular troops, (ii) that all the resources (known and unknown) shall (hereafter) vest in the

donees, and (iii) that all the revenues shall (hereafter) be collected by the donees. This our gift should be assented to and protected by our descendants and by future kings and *bhogapatis*, considering that the world in essence is (fragile) like a reed, bamboo or plantain tree, and life (ephemeral) like a bubble of water. He, who, with his mind clouded by the darkness of ignorance, would confiscate this (gift) or assent to its being confiscated, shall be cursed with the five great sins. It has been declared by the venerable Vedavyāsa : "The donor of land stays in heaven for sixty thousand years. The confiscator or the abettor (of confiscation) would dwell for the same period in hell. (\*1) "Those who confiscate the land-grants are born in the waterless wastes of Vindhya as black serpents residing in the dry hollows of trees." (\*2) "Land has been enjoyed by many kings like Sagara and others. The merit (of the grant) accrues to him whosoever is the owner of the land at different times". (\*3) Śaṃvat 663, (the month) Āśvayuja, on the thirteenth bright lunar day, on Monday. This has been written by Kukkura, called Gavāṅgabābbā.

### *The Rāṣṭrakūṭas*

The term *rāṣṭrakūṭa* has no ethnic or tribal significance. Only an officer of a *Rāṣṭra* was denoted by this term. A *Rāṣṭra* was a territorial division in which a kingdom was divided. The Deccan records of the seventh and eighth centuries make mention of *Rāṣṭrakūṭas* and *Grāmakūṭas*, of which the latter was the Headman of a village. Both of them were exhorted to refrain from interfering with or disturbing the peaceful enjoyment of land-grants.<sup>1</sup>

Antroli-Chharoli inscription mentions a *Rāṣṭrakūṭa* family of Nannarāja beside mentioning the *Rāṣṭrakūṭas* separately.<sup>2</sup> Nannarāja was the great grandson of Durgarāja, the grandson of Govindarāja and the son of Svāmikarāja, ruling in Berār with capital at Elicpūr. There is, however, no direct evidence to connect the Nannarāja's house with that of Dantidurga, but the identity of their Garuḍa seal and of the names of Nannarāja's ancestors and Dantidurga's predecessors and successors, raise a strong presumption that they belonged to the same house. Again, Karkkarāja II of the Antroli-Chharoli plates, who was a contemporary of Dantidurga and ruling over a portion of Lāṭa which he claims to have conquered too, has a Garuḍa seal and the names of his ancestors similar to those of Dantidurga. This shows a close connection of Karkkarāja's house also with Dantidurga's house, but their precise relation is not known..

1. EHD. p. 249.

EL.XI, pp. 276ff.; IA. XVIII, pp. 230 ff 2.

*Stock and nationality*

In their later records,<sup>3</sup> the ancestry of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas is traced to the race of Yadu, which suggestion may have come from an inscription of Govinda III (A.D. 808) in which his birth is claimed to have made the family as invincible as the Yadu race by the birth of Murāri (Kṛṣṇa). The Garuḍa figure on their seals indicates that they were Vaiṣṇavas like the Guptas.

From Karhad and Deolī plates<sup>4</sup> of Kṛṣṇa III, R.G. Bhandarkar made the suggestion that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had descended from a family called Tuṅga after the name of a king.<sup>5</sup> But this does not help in determining the stock and the original home of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

Fleet derived the name of the Rāthor Rājapūṭas from the term Rāṣṭrakūṭa which family should belong to the Rājapūṭānā-Kanauj country.<sup>6</sup> But the Rāthors, who were much later, might have been the descendants of such Rāṣṭrakūṭas as were left behind in North India during the northern campaigns of Dhruva I, Govinda III and Kṛṣṇa III.

Burnell's theory that the Malkad Rāṣṭrakūṭas were the Telugus descended from the Reḍḍi stock of Āndhra,<sup>7</sup> does not seem tenable; for, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had not come into prominence in that country, nor did their expansion begin from Telugu speaking region. C.V. Vaidya<sup>8</sup> would make them a Mahārāṣṭra family ruling at Elicpūr, speaking Marāṭhī and the ancestor of the modern Marāṭhas. This view too is unacceptable.

Altekar has shown that the main line, which was later established at Malkad, has to be connected with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family ruling at Elicpūr. But the ancestors of Dantidurga were of Canarese origin, because Canarese was their mother-tongue and Canarese literature flourished in their court.<sup>9</sup> According to him, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were the descendants of some of the feudatory Rāṣṭrakūṭa families of Aśoka's time, the earliest forms of whose family name occur in his edicts as *raṭhikas*, *riṣṭikas*, *raṣṭikas* or *raṭrikas*.<sup>10</sup> This view seems to be more probable.

*Political Condition of India before the Rise of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas*

It is necessary to review the political conditions prevailing in

3. e.g. Sanjī: Plates of A.D. 871.

4. E. V, pp. 142ff.; Bom.Gaz. I. ii. 384.

5. EI. IV, p. 278.

6. Bom. Gaz. I. ii. 384.

7. South Indian Palaography, p. 10.

8. HMHI. II, p. 249, Marāṭhī edit on.

9. RK. p. 21.

10. ibid. p. 19.

India before the Rāṣṭrakūṭas rose to become a sovereign power. It is not known who succeeded Yaśovarman to the throne of Kanauj. In Bengal, Gopāla I was trying to restore order in the anarchy that had followed the death of Śaśāṅka and held that country in its grip for more than a century.<sup>11</sup> In the South, the power of the Cālukyas was being weakened by their hereditary wars with the Pallavas. The ancestors of Dantidurga were ruling over a portion of Berār<sup>12</sup> under the suzerainty of the Cālukya king of Veṅḡ, Jayavardhana, who rose to power, must have captured some portion of Cālukyan dominions in the North. In Eastern Kosala, Udayana was ruling at Sirpur near Raipur by the middle of the eighth century. The Gūrjara house ruled at Bhinamī in Rājapūṭānā, and the other in Mālvā. From Sindh, the Arabs were carrying on raids on both this Gūrjara houses as well as on the kingdoms of Valabhī and Nandipurī.<sup>13</sup>

### *Dantidurga - His Date and Achievements*

It was in the above political conditions that Indra I, the father of Dantidurga, began his political career. In c. 725 A.D. Jayabhaṭa III of Broach,<sup>14</sup> having made alliance with Maṅḡlarasa, the Cālukya king of the Gujarāt Branch, conquered the districts of Kairā and Pañcmahal from the Valabhī king. Indra I, who was probably present at Kairā as a feudatory of the Cālukya king of Veṅḡ, carried away the princess Bhavagaṇā, the daughter of the Cālukya king of Gujarāt, from the marriage pavilion (*kheṭaka*) and married her by the *rākṣasa* form of marriage.<sup>15</sup> As a matter of fact, the fortunes of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family began to rise during the reign of Dantidurga the son of Indra I. Dantidurga's victorious campaigns are described in a high-flown language in the Samangaḍ Plates<sup>16</sup> (A.D. 753-54) and Daśavatāra Cave inscription of Ellorā.<sup>17</sup> The present Ellorā Plates are the earliest record of Śaka year 663 (acc. to S.K. Dikshit), executed on Monday, the 13th bright lunar day of the month Āsvayuja (Āśvina) which according to S.K. Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*, is not regular, but corresponds to 17th September, A.D. 742, i.e. Śaka 664 expired.<sup>18</sup> These plates were issued during the time when Dantidurga still a feudatory of the Cālukya king Kirtivarman II as is evident from his titles. But his Samangaḍ Plates show that he had gained independence before A.D. 753-54. He died childless and was succeeded by his uncle Kṛṣṇa I.

11. AIK. p. 44.

12. According to Mirashi, they were ruling over Mūlaka (modern Aurangabad) where the earliest inscriptions of the family have been found (POC. XV. Summary of Papers, p. 98).

13. RK. p. 31.

14. IA. V, p. 112.

15. Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarṣa, EI. XVIII, p. 252.

16. IA. XI, p. 111.

17. ASWL. V, p. 92.

18. EI. XXV, p. 26.

In an attempt to decide the date of Dantidurga, the problem arises whether we should accept Dikshit's reading of the date as 663 of the Saka era, or that of Mirashi as 463 of the Kalachuri era.<sup>19</sup> Here D C. Sircar<sup>20</sup> says that according to Dikshit's reading, the reign of Dantidurga may be assigned to A.D. 740-755 (16 years), while Mirashi's reading would extend his reign to about 45 years (A.D. 711-12 to 756). Even if Dantidurga had ascended the throne at the age of 15, he would then have died at 60 in the latter case. Sircar has drawn attention to a verse<sup>21</sup> in an inscription on a pillar in the Rāmalingeśvara temple at Rāmeśvara near Proddatur (Cuddapah District, Andhra Pradesh) which says that Sāhasatuṅga (alias Dantidurga) died young. Hence, Dikshit's reading of the date appears to be nearer the mark than that of Mirashi's because Dantidurga would have been young at the age of 40 even if he had ascended the throne at the age less than 25. Altekar<sup>22</sup> has put the accession of Dantidurga in c. 733 A.D. The precise date of his death is not known. Since his successor Kṛṣṇa I, was ruling in A.D. 758, and his Samangaḍ plates are dated A.D. 754, he would have died about A.D. 756.

The present inscription describes him as having fought on the banks of the rivers Mahī, Mahānadī and Revā, and conquered the kingdoms of Kāñcī, Kaliṅga, Kosala, Ś-Īśaila, Mālava, Lāṭa and Taṅka. In later epigraphs, he is said to have seized sovereign power from the Cālukyas,<sup>23</sup> and broken the pride of all kings from Himālaya to the Setubandha in the extreme south.<sup>24</sup>

Some of Dantidurga's conquests were probably made during the period when he was a feudatory of the Cālukyas. On that hypothesis, his achievements may be tentatively described in the following sequence:

A few years after Dantidurga's accession, Junaid, the Arab Governor of Sindh, who had defeated the Saindhava, Maithra and Gūjjara kings, invaded Gujarāt. Vikramāditya II, the feudal lord of Dantidurga, and the Gujarāt feudatory Pulakeśin Janāśraya who

19. POC. XV, Summary of Papers, pp. 97-98; JBBRAS, N.S., XXVI, pp. 163 ff.

20. (Gopināthi) *Kavirāja Volume*, pp. 481-82.

21. *tasmin sāhasataṅga-nāma-nṛpatau svaḥ-sundarī-prārthite*  
*yāte yūni divaṃ divākara-samaṃ veśyeva lakṣmīḥ totaḥ |*  
*taṃ tvavāpya bhujadvayena nibhṛtaṃ samśliṣṭya ramyair guṇaiḥ*  
*prīṭhā prāṇa-samaṃ ciraṃ ramayati śrīkṛṣṇarājādhipam ||*

"When the young king Sāhasatuṅga (i.e. Dantidurga), on being sought by the celestial beauties, went to heaven like the sun, then Lakṣmī, like a harlot, having drawn the illustrious king Kṛṣṇarāja by her charming qualities and embraced him with both arms, enjoyed him long out of love as if he were her very life."

22. AIK. p. 1.

23. EI. IV, p. 287.

24. *ibid.* XVIII, p. 252.

succeeded to the throne of Gujarāt, organized a common front to repulse the invasion. This seems to have been referred to in the Ellorā Daśavatāra cave inscription in the expression *sandhu-bhūpādhiṣṭhān* in which the word *sandhu* has been corrected to *sindhu* by Altekar.<sup>25</sup> In a grim fight near Navasāri in A.D. 738, the invaders were so thoroughly routed that they never dared invade Gujarāt again. Vikramāditya II, the Cālukya emperor, was so impressed by the heroism of his feudatories that he invested Pulakeśin with title of *Cālukya-kulālcikkāra*, *Prṭhivi-vallabha* and *Avanī-janāśraya*; and Dantidurga with *Prṭhivivallabha* and *Khaḍgā-valoka*.<sup>26</sup>

Dantidurga<sup>27</sup> remained a loyal feudatory of the Cālukya house of Veṅgī for some years, and participated in the campaign of his overlord Vikramāditya II against Kāncī and earned credit for his victory over the Pallavas. It may also be assumed that, on his return, he took part in the attacks made by Vikramāditya on the king of Śrīśaila. These northern and southern campaigns gave Dantidurga much military experience, and he naturally became more ambitious. On the death of Vikramāditya in A.D. 747, he embarked on *dig-vijaya*, and avoiding any encroachments on the Cālukyan empire, he is said to have wiped out the Gūṛjara kingdom of Nandīpurī (Nāndī) and appointed his nephew Karkka to rule over the region.<sup>28</sup> But according to R. C. Majumdar, since Nāgabhaṭa I, the Gūṛjara king is acknowledged as suzerain by Bhartṛvaḍḍha, the Cāhamāna ruler of Broach, in A.D. 758 Dantidurga could not have conquered permanently the territory north of the Kīṁ river, i.e. the old principality of Nandīpurī.<sup>29</sup> Dantidurga also annexed the Cālukyan principality of Navasāri, and then turned his attention towards Mālvā. Having conquered it, he, along with other princes, performed the *Hiraṇyagarbhādāna* ceremony at its capital Ujjayinī where he made the Gūṛjara and some other kings act as door-keepers (*pratihāra*) at the sacrifice.<sup>30</sup> Next he proceeded against Mahākosala of the Chatigṛh division of the Madhya Pradesh and brought it under his sway. While returning, he defeated some local rulers in Kālīṅga. By these successful expeditions, the whole of Madhya Pradesh and Central and Southern Gujarāt came under his political influence.

25. EHD. p. 255

26. AIK. p. 2; EHD, pp. 253-54.

27. He is also sometimes referred to as Dantivarman II (CA 248). A Dantivarman is mentioned in the *Bharatavākya* of some MSS of *Mudrārākṣasa*, where he is said to have defeated the Mlecchas and saved the earth from their onslaughts. If the two be taken to be identical, it would help in fixing the controversial date of Viśākhadatta, the author of the *Mudrārākṣasa*.

28. AIK. p. 2.

29. *ibid.* pp. 20-21.

30. *Sanjan Plates*, HK, pp. 226-27.



Now Kirtivarman II, who had succeeded Vikramāditya II on the throne of Veṅgī, observing the rising power of Dantidurga with concern tried to reinstate the Gujarāt family at Navasārī. As Dantidurga refused to vacate Southern Gujarāt, war ensued, and by some stratagem, Dantidurga overcame the Karṇāṭaka army without the use of weapons. By this victory, he became the master of the whole of Mahārāṣṭra by the end of A.D. 753, and assumed the full imperial titles of *Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka*.<sup>31</sup> Kirtivarman however, was not entirely vanquished, and continued to rule the whole of Karṇāṭaka. Unfortunately, Dantidurga's triumphant career was cut short by his death some time before A.D. 758, probably in A.D. 756. Thus, his dream of overthrowing the Cālukya power completely remained unrealized.

Dantidurga was an astute statesman, a great strategist, an able military commander, clever diplomat and an excellent administrator. He continued to be faithful to his feudal lord as long as it suited to his interests, but struck as soon as he found him grown weak by his wars against the Pallavas and the Arabs. The records of his uncle Kṛṣṇa I<sup>32</sup>, who succeeded him give the credit of Cālukya overthrow to Dantidurga, but later Cālukya record,<sup>33</sup> attribute it to Kṛṣṇa himself. It appears, therefore, that Kṛṣṇa only completed the work of his nephew.

---

31. AIK. p. 2.

32. Talegaon and Bhandak plates, EI. XIII, p. 275ff.;  
ibid. XIV, pp. 101-102.

33. IA. XI, pp. 1581ff.; EI. VI, pp. 242ff.; IA. XII, pp. 151ff.; EI. I, pp. 52ff., etc.

### ABBREVIATIONS

AIK	... <i>Age of Imperial Kanauj</i> , Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan.
ASWI	... <i>Archaeological Survey of Western India</i> .
Bom. Gaz.	... <i>Bombay Gazetteer</i> .
EHD	... <i>Early History of Deccan</i> , A.S. Altekar.
EI	... <i>Epigraphia Indica</i> .
HK	... <i>History of Kanauj</i> , R.S. Tripathi.
HMHI	... <i>History of Mediaeval Hindu India</i> , C.V. Vaidya.
IA	... <i>Indian Antiquary</i> .
JBBRAS	... <i>Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society</i> .
POC	... <i>Proceedings of Oriental Conference</i> .
RK	... <i>Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times</i> , A.S. Altekar.

## NOTES

1. पञ्चमहाशब्द (line 1) — It refers to the privilege of enjoying the tunes of five main musical instruments, namely a horn, a tabor, a conch-shell, a kettle-drum and a gong. In the South this privilege was allowed by the overlords to their feudatories of high rank and authority. It was rarely used by independent monarchs. In the North, however, this expression denoted the five great titles beginning with the adjective *mahat*.
2. महासामन्ताधिपति (line 2) — It was feudatory title. In Kannaḍa, the superintendent of revenues (*Accupannāpadadhiṣṭhāyaka*) was also sometimes called *Mahāsāmantādhīpati*.
3. भोगिक (line 9) — Enjoyer of a *Jāgīr*, also called *ināmdār*. Some explain the term as 'the head of a district' or the collector of the State's share of the produce of lands (*bhoga*) (*Bom. Gaz. I, pt. i*). Also called *Bhogapati*.
4. विषयपति (line 9) — Governor of a district.
5. महत्तर (line 9) — 'An elder of a town or village.' According to A. Stein, 'a chamberlain, or a village headman, or head of a family or community and a member of the village council.' (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*).

Dr. K.S. RAMAMURTI

## RASIKO NAṬAḤ

The Upaniṣadic statement *rasam hy evāyaṃ labdhvā 'nandī bhavati* is well made use of by the Sanskrit Rhetoricians to establish that it is only the *rasa* embedded in a composition gives the highest pleasure. Evolution of *rasa* is clear in the *sūtra* '*vibhāvānubhāva-vybhicāri-saṃyogāt rasaniṣpattiḥ*' of Bharata in his *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

This *sūtra* does not speak of the person in whom the *rasa* resides; that is, whether it is in the actor or the spectator, or the character. But Abhinava Gupta commenting on this exposes the theories of his noted predecessors.

Of the Ālaṅkārikas that dealt with this problem it is well known that Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, Śrī Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinavagupta are famous for their analysis. According to Lollaṭa who lived about the beginning of the ninth century in Kashmir, *abhidhā*, is comprehensive enough to include any implication or suggestion. Śrī Śaṅkuka who is said to have criticised the views of Lollaṭa on *rasa* must have been a younger contemporary of Lollaṭa. He is believed to have been during the reign of Ajātapīḍa, the king of Kashmir (A.D. 814-851). Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who differs from the *Dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana might have been in the court of Avantivarman and Śaṅkaravarman of Kashmir (A.D. 855-884). Abhinavagupta the upholder of the *Dhvani* theory and the famous commentator on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata is the last greatest scholar who analysed the process of the development and enjoyment of *rasa*.

All these four have interpreted the *rasasūtra* – *vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-saṃyogāt rasaniṣpattiḥ* of Bharata. Here *saṃyoga* and *niṣpatti* are the two main terms that required elucidation. According to Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa the word *saṃyoga* is used in the sense of *utpādyā-utpādaka-*

*bhāva*, *gaṇya-gamaka-bhāva* and *poṣya-poṣaka-bhāva*;<sup>1</sup> and the word *niṣpatti* stands for *uṣpatti*, *abhiryakti* and *puṣṭi*. He says that *sthāyī-bhāva* is generated in the characters like Rāma, in the presence of the *ālambana-vibhāvas* like Sītā and the *uddīpana-vibhāvas* like the garden. This swells up with the aid of the side glances, etc., and finally developed by the *vyabhicāribhāvas* like *smṛti*. This *sthāyībhāva* in this state becomes *rasa*. As such this *rasa* resides in the characters like Rāma in the beginning. But when the actors imitate these characters on the stage, *rasa* appears to have been residing in the actors because of their skill in acting, like a rope which appearing like a serpent generates fear in a spectator. This illusory *rasa* in the actor passes on to the spectators who enjoy it in an extraordinary manner. From this it is understood that *rasa* originally resides in the character only; but only appears to have been residing in the actor who is an adept in the field and then enters the spectator, i.e. the *rasa* resides only in the hero and nowhere else. Hence it is *utpādyā* or *janya* or *kārya*. *Vibhāvas* become *utpādakas*, *janakas* or *kārakas* and the *anubhāvas* are *gamakas*. The *sañcārins* or *vyabhicāribhāvas* become *poṣakas*. This means that the *rasa* is generated in the heroes like Rāma on account of the *vibhāva* like Sītā. This is indicated by the *anubhāvas* and developed by the *sañcārins*. Because the actor imitates these states, it appears as though he is possessing *rasa* which is finally transferred to the spectator.

Śaṅkuka who is next to Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa is his junior contemporary. He advocates that *rasa* resides in the actor but not in the character as Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa postulated. Hence *rasa* in this school is called *anukartr-niṣṭha* but not *anukārya-niṣṭha* as in the case of Lollaṭa.

After Śrī Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka subjected this to a still closer examination. He feels that *rasa* neither resides in the character nor in the actor. But it resides only in the spectator. If it resides in either of them it is not possible for the spectator to enjoy this. Here a doubt regarding the spectator enjoying the *rasa* arises on the basis of the fact that the *vibhāvas* like Sītā, responsible for the development of *rasa*, are not the *vibhāvas* to the spectators and without the *vibhāvas* there can never be *rasa*, as there can never be the effect in the absence of cause. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's explanation for this is that *rasa* is twofold, (a) *laukika* and (b) *alaukika*. The *laukika-śṛṅgāra* pertains only to the *laukika* heroes. The heroes in the poetical works are not *laukikas*. They are *alaukikas* and the *rasa* concerning them is *alaukika*. Though this *alaukika-rasa* is connected with the *alaukika* heroes it is only the *laukika* spectators that enjoy it.

1 The *sthāyī* like *ratī* is generated (*utpādyā*) by the *vibhāvas* (*utpādakas*); noticed (*gaṇya*) by the *anubhāvas* (*gamakas*) and developed (*puṣṭā*) by the *vyabhicārins* (*poṣakas*).

A word has got three functions, namely *abhidhā*, *bhāvakaiva* and *bhojakatva* or *bhogikṛta*. The *abhidhā* indicates only the verbal meaning of the word. The *bhāvakaiva* function indicates the sentiment of the word and the *bhojakatva* function helps the connoisseur to enjoy it (*rasa*).<sup>2</sup> As soon as the function of the *abhidhā* ceases the function of *bhāvakaiva* starts. This transforms the *vibhāvas*, etc., as generalised sentiments which is known as *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*, i.e., in this process Rāma and Sītā appear before the spectator as ordinary persons, rid of their individuality and sanctuous halo, i.e. they become the ordinary hero and heroine (This type of transformation is because of that function *bhāvakaiva*). At this state arises oneness between the hero and the spectator. After this function ceases the function of *bhojakatva* begins. The *rati*, etc., which are transformed into generalised sentiments become enjoyable to the spectator with the aid of this function *bhojakatva*. The *bhojakatva* function wards off the qualities of *rajas* and *tamas* of the spectator, when the *saiva-guṇa* bubbles up. In this state the *rati*, etc., that are real without any connection with the worldly objects take possession of the spectator. At the time of this bliss the mind possesses the qualities of *druti*, *visāra* and *vikāsa*.<sup>3</sup> In this theory the word *samyoga* means *bhāvakaiva* and *niṣpatti* means *āsvāda*. The *vibhāvas*, etc., are *bhojakas* and *rasa* is *bhojya*. This is called the *bhukti* theory.

Abhinavagupta who commented on the *Dhvanyāloka* also is the last greatest analyst. His analysis is based on the quality *vāsanā* which is accepted by philosophers and others. Bhaṭṭanāyaka did not speak of this *vāsanā*, whereas Abhinavagupta bases his theory on this. This theory is known as *Abhivyakti* Theory. *Abhivyakti* is nothing but revealing what is already existing. The *vibhāvas* manifest the *śihāyibhāvas* like *rati*, etc., that lie embedded in the reader or spectator in the form of *vāsanā* and this manifested *śihāyi* itself becomes *rasa*. He explains this as follows: Śakuntalā and Duṣyanta are the *ālambanas* for the *rati*. The *malaya* breeze and the moonlight are *uddīpanas*. The tears are the effects (*kāryas*), lamentation, etc., are the concomitants (*sahakārins*). These *karana*, *kārya* and *sahakārins* assume the technical terms *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāri bhāvas* in the parlance of a composition. This means that the hero and heroine like Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā mutually become *ālambana-vibhāvas*; moonlight, etc., the *uddīpana-vibhāvas*, the tears *anubhāvas*, and the lamentation, etc., the *vyabhicāribhāvas*.

*Vibhāva* is that which is associated with the action of *vibhāvanā*.

2. *abhidhā bhāvanā cānyā tadbhogikṛtam eva ca*, *Nāṭyaśāstra*, ch. VI, p. 277 Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. XXXVI.
3. *rasa 'nubhavasmr̥tyādivilakṣaṇena rajastamo 'nuvedhavaicitryabalād drutivistāra-vikāsalakṣaṇena sattvodorekaprakāśānandamayanijasamvidviśrāntilakṣaṇena parabrahmāsvādasavidhena bhogena parm bhujyata iti*, *ibid*.

This action is responsible for making the *rati*, etc., that lie embedded in the form of *vāsanā* in the hearts of the *sahṛdayas* enjoyable. It is only the hero and heroine that are responsible for the manifestation of *rati* in the critics. Hence this action is *vibhāvanā*. That which possess this (*vibhāvanā*) is *vibhāva*. To make *rati*, etc., which are in the form of *vāsanā* enjoyable is *anubhāvanā* and which possess this (*anubhāvanā*) is *anubhāva*. To make *rati*, etc., spread over the entire text or composition is *vyabhicāraṇa*. That which possess this (*vyabhicāraṇa*) is *vyabhicāri-bhāva*. *Vyabhicāri-bhāvas* are also called *sañcāri-bhāvas*.

The *sahṛdaya* is one who has got a heart equal to that of the poet and the hero.<sup>4</sup> As such the heart of a reader or spectator becomes a clean mirror (rid of the wordly possessions) on account of his constant concentration. The *vibhāvas*, etc., that the portrayed in the composition directly reflect in it, when there is the direct union between his heart and the heart of the hero. Those who are capable of attaining this are only the *sahṛdayas*. When the *sahṛdaya* witnesses these *vibhāvas* in the composition the *sattva-guṇa* in him is roused. *Sattva* is one that is free from the qualities of *rajas* and *tamas*. Because of the excitement of this *sattva-guṇa*, the *vibhāvas* that are in the form of *vāsanā* in him get manifested, i.e., the *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* that lie in the form of *vāsanā* in a *sahṛdaya* make *rati*, etc., apparent. By thinking of them again and again they become generalized.

At this stage the Śakuntalā and Duṣyanta of the poet appear to a *sahṛdaya* as ordinary lovers when his limitations vanish. This means that he forgets himself and this world. He does not think that he or any other is enjoying these *ratis*, etc. He experiences a bliss. All this happens because of the strength of the *vibhāvas* only.

This *bhāvanā* or experience is called the *sādhārṇīkarṇa* or the process of generalization (as observed above). In this process the spectator becomes one with the hero of the composition, when he experiences the *rasa* in this undifferentiated state.<sup>5</sup>

As long as the *sahṛdaya* thinks of these *vibhāvas*, etc., in an unified manner he dwells in this state of bliss. The moment he stops the chewing the cud of the *vibhāvas* this blissful state ceases. This enjoy-

4. *yeṣāṃ kāvyānuśīlanābhāsavasāḍ viśadībhūte manomukure varṇanīyatanmayī-bhāvanayogyatā te hrdayasambadabhājah sahṛdayāḥ*,

Abhinavagupt' on *Dhvanyāloka*, p. 11. Nirnayasagar edn.

5. *bhāvābhīnayasambuddhān sthāyībhāvāṃs tat'ā budhāḥ, Nīṭyaśāstra*,

VI. 33 and also its comment on this.

ment which is known as *rasānanda* lasts till the existence of the *vibhāvas*, etc. This *rasānanda* is akin to the *Brahmānanda*. *Brahmānanda* is absolute *ānanda* whereas the *rasānanda* is connected with the *vibhāvas*, etc.

In this theory the word *saṃyoga* means *vyāṅgya-vyāñjaka-bhāva* and the word *niṣpatti* means *abhivyakti*. As such on account of the *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyāñjaka-bhāvas* that are *vyāñjakas*, the *śihāyī* becomes *vyāṅgya* transforming into *rasa*.

From an account of the above it can be clearly seen that there are three different types of analysis and explanations. Jagannātha Paṇḍita the last greatest original rhetorician also seems to have favoured the views of Abhinavagupta in stating that *rasa* is *sāmājakaniṣṭha*, i.e. *rasa* resides in the spectator.<sup>6</sup>

At this juncture if we look back we notice that Śrī Śaṅkuka has postulated the theory that *rasa* is *naṭaniṣṭha*. A close investigation into the literature reveals that discussions and debates regarding the persons who enjoy this *rasa* and the process of enjoyment were prevalent even before the beginnings of the christian era. Probably it was the most accepted theory that *rasa* is *naṭaniṣṭha* at the time of Patañjali which might be inferred from his example *rasiko naṭaḥ*. Dealing with the *sūtra rasādibhyāsa ca* (V. ii 95) he gives the example *rasiko naṭaḥ*. The *sūtra* deals with the *matubārtha* (possessive sense) suffixes. It is enough if he gives the word *rasika* only to indicate that *rasika* is one who possess *rasa*. But he adds the word *naṭaḥ* also there. From this it can be inferred that the view that *rasa* is *naṭaniṣṭha* was prevalent during the period of Patañjali who is famous for his living expressions. We also understand from the *sūtra* of Pāṇini *pārāśaryasilālibhyām*..... (IV. iii. 110) commented upon by Patañjali that the *naṭa-sūtra* of Silālin<sup>7</sup> were known in that period.

From this we understand that Śrī Śaṅkuka based his theory that *rasa* is *naṭaniṣṭha*. According to him the spectator infers *raṭi* in the actor with the aid of the combination of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *sañcārībhāva* on the syllogism of logic.<sup>8</sup> That is there is *raṭi*, etc., in the

6 *aṣṭāv eva rasā nāṭyeṣv iti kecid a ūcidan !*

*taḍ ucārū, yataḥ kañcin na rasam svadate naṭaḥ |*

*Rasagaṅgādhara*, p. 135. Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan Series, 1970.

7. There existed three kinds of *naṭas* - (1) *śailālī* or *śailūṣa* (2) *kṛśāśvi* or *jāyājīva* and (3) *bharata* or *naṭa*,

*Amarakośa*, II. 10. 12.

8. The logicians say that wherever there is smoke there is the inference of fire. In the same manner wherever there is the combination of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *sañcārībhāva* there is *raṭi*.

actor who is in the role of Rāma, etc., and therefore there is *rasa* in him. This inference is not dry as the inference of *dhūmāgni* but is made pleasant with the help of paraferalia and the language of the actor. The spectator enjoys the same *sthāyibhāva* residing in the actor when he feels happy.<sup>9</sup> Therefore the *rasa* dwells in the actor. In this theory the word *saṃyoga* of the Bharatasūtra means *gaṇya-gamaka-bhāva* or *jñāpya-jñāpaka-bhāva* and the word *niṣpīti* means *anumiti* or *jñapti*. Because of the *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāri bhāvas* which are said to be *jñāpakas* the *sthāyi*, which is a *jñāpya*, becomes *rasa*. Hence this is known as the theory of *anumiti*. This theory seems to have been developed on the ground known to Patañjali.

Finally we conclude that all these theories which existed in between the eighth and sixteenth centuries had their roots in about 150 B.C. though their entire texts are not clearly unearthed.

9. (*saṃyag-mithyā-saṃśaya-sāḍṣya-pratītibhyo vilakṣaṇā citraturagādinyāyena*)  
*yaḥ sukhī rāmaḥ asāv ayam iti pratītir asīti,*

*Nāṭyaśāstra*, ch. VI, p. 273.



Dr. M.S. NARAYANA MURTI

## BHARTṚHARI ON 'VIŚEṢAṆĀNĀM CĀJĀTEḤ' OF PĀṆINI

While commenting upon the rule *viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ*, Pā. I. ii. 52, Patañjali gives out the traditional interpretation before offering his own meaning. At first the rule I. ii. 52 is treated as an ancillary to the rule *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane* (I. ii. 51) which enjoins the number and gender of the stem to the derivative, the *taddhita* affix of which is elided by *lup* by a rule.<sup>1</sup> For example the word *pañcālāḥ* meaning 'the region where the people called *Pañcālas* live' is derived from the word *pañcāla* by adding the affix *aḥ* (IV. ii. 69) which is subsequently elided by the rule *janapade lup* (IV. ii. 81). So the word *pañcāla* means 'the region' and is represented by the analytical sentence *pañcālānām nivāso janapadaḥ*. Here the question is whether the derivative form should conform to the number and gender of the referent of the elided suffix which is *janapada* or region here, or to those of the stem to which the suffix is added. The rule in question enjoins the addition of the number and gender of the stem.

If the rule I. ii. 52 is taken as an ancillary to the rule I. ii. 51, it comes to mean that the rule is a *vidhi* (*apūrva-vidhi*) enjoining the same number and gender of the *lubanta* derivative to the *viśeṣaṇas* of the referent of the elided suffix (*lubartha*). Thus in the expression *pañcālā ramaṇiyā bahvannāḥ* the *viśeṣaṇas* – *ramaṇiya* and *bahvanna* take the same number and gender of the *lubanta*, namely *pañcālāḥ*.

But this interpretation does not provide a substantial ground for the enunciation of the rule because even otherwise the same number and gender could be obtained on account of the *anuvṛtti* of the word *samānādhikaraṇa* from the rule *taipuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ*

---

1. According to the canons of grammar the *pratyaya* is *pradhāna* or *viśeṣya* while the *prakṛti* is an *upasarjana* or *viśeṣaṇa*.

*karmadhārayaḥ* (I. ii. 42)<sup>2</sup>. It goes without saying that in collocation the qualifier always agrees with its qualificant in number and gender. Thus the *viśeṣaṇas* of the *lubanta* also get the same number and gender without a special rule to that effect.<sup>3</sup>

It is, therefore, suggested that the rule may be looked upon as a *niyama-vidhi* restricting the transference of number and gender of the substance only to those *viśeṣaṇas* which are not expressive of *jāti*<sup>4</sup> or which are not indirectly connected to the derivative through a *jāti*<sup>5</sup>. Thus in the expression *pañcālāḥ janapadaḥ* the word *janapada* does not take the same number and gender of the derivative because it is a *jāti*. Similarly in the expression *pañcālo janapado raṇaṇīyo bahvanraḥ*, the *viśeṣaṇas* – *raṇaṇīya* and *bahvanra* do not agree in gender and number with *pañcālāḥ* because they are related through the *jātivācaka*.

This explanation also does not necessitate the rule because the *jāti* wherever it is used as a *viśeṣaṇa* does not change its gender in conformity with the *viśeṣya*. The reason is that the *jāti* invariably takes a particular gender and it does not forsake its gender till it becomes obsolete.<sup>6</sup> For example in the expression *badarī sūkṣmaṇṭṭikā vṛkṣaḥ*, the word *vṛkṣa* – the *viśeṣaṇa* of *badarī* (fem) does not change its gender.<sup>7</sup> Thus the restriction could not be maintained as confined only to those of the *viśeṣaṇas* of a *lubanta*.

Therefore against the background of these two explanations the rule does not show any definite purpose.<sup>8</sup> Now Patañjali says that the rule indeed is indispensable and it purports to enjoin the transference

2. 'tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ' ity atāḥ samānādhikaraṇānuvṛtteḥ, Haradatta's *Padamañjarī* (PM) on the *Kāśikā*, I. ii. 52, p. 356. Prācya Bhāratī Series – 2; Varanasi, 1965.

3. *samānādhikaraṇatvād viśeṣaṇānām yuktavaabdhāvo bhaviṣyati*, *Mahābhāṣya* (MB), I. ii. 52, p. 86. Edited with Kāśikā's *Pradīpa* (KP) and Nāṣeśa's *Udyota* (NU) by Guruprasādaśāstri, Rājasthānasamskṛtagranthamāṇsā No. 30, Benare, 1939.

See also :

*lubantaviśeṣaṇānām hi lubarthasamānādhikaraṇatvāt 'lupī yuktavad' ity ane-naiva lubarthagataliṅgasamkhyayoh siddhatvāt*, Helārāja's commentary *Prakṛṇa-prakāśa* (HP) on *Vākyapaṭīya* (VP), III. Vṛtti, 134, p. 69. University of Travancore Sanskrit Series No. CXLVIII.

4. *jātinivṛttyartho 'yam ārambhaḥ*, MB. I. ii. 52, p. 86.

5. *jātyarthasya cāyam yuktavadbhāvaḥ pravartate utpattiprabhṛty āvināśān na talliṅgaḥ jāhātī*, MB. I. ii. 52, p. 87.

6. *āviṣṭalingā jātiḥ yallīṅgaḥ upādāya pravartate utpattiprabhṛty āvināśān na talliṅgaḥ jāhātī*, MB. I. ii. 52, p. 87.

7. *lupo 'nyatrāpi jāter yuktavadbhāvo na bhavati. kvānyatra ? badarī sūkṣmaṇṭṭikā madhurā vṛkṣa iti*, ibid. pp. 86 – 87.

*na tarhi idāntm ayaṃ yogo vaktavyaḥ*, ibid.

of the number and gender of the substance (*āśraya*) to the quality word. Thus he concludes without any further elaboration : *idaṃ tatra tatrocycate* – '*guṇavacanānāṃ śabdānāṃ āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti*' *iti tad anena kriyate*.

### What is *Guṇavacana*?

It is not easy to decide the exact sense in which the word *guṇavacana* is used by Patañjali. He himself states that the word *guṇa* has many meanings and Pāṇini uses the word in its popular senses also wherever possible.<sup>9</sup> With reference to its technical sense, the grammarians adopt the Vaiśeṣika definition and classification of *guṇa* but interpret them with their own notions. The Vaiśeṣika *guṇas* could be expressed by words in two ways; one, as an independent quality without any reference to its substratum and the other, as existing in an object as qualifying it.<sup>10</sup> For example the words *rūpa*, 'colour' and *gandha*, 'smell' express the qualities as independent of the thing in which they inhere, e.g. *candanasya gandhaḥ* or *candanaḥ gandhavān*. On the other hand the quality words like *śukla* denote their colour whiteness as existing in the substratum in which they are found.<sup>11</sup> Hence in the expression *śuklaḥ paṭ h* the word *śukla* denotes the white colour as existing in cloth. The distinction could be well represented by the fact that the compound *candanagandhaḥ* could be formed from the analytical sentence *candanasya gandhaḥ*<sup>12</sup> while the compounding is prohibited from the sentence *brāhmaṇasya śuklāḥ*.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand the expression *candanam gandhaḥ* is never found because *gandha* always stands for the quality and it is not used for the quality as existing in a thing. Thus to convey the substratum it should take the possessive affix *matup* as *gandhavān*. Therefore on the basis of the difference in function, the quality words are divided into two types. And from the contextual evidence of the places where the association of number and gender is justified by quoting *guṇavacanānāṃ śabdānāṃ āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti*, and the examples cited for illustration under the *vārttika* – *guṇavacanabhyo matupo luk* under the rule V. ii 94,<sup>14</sup>

9. For a detail description see K.A. Subramania Iyer : *Bhartṛhari*, the section on Quality, pp 264 - 273, Poona, 1969.

10. *ibid.* p. 267.

11. Cf. *bhavati hi guṇābhīdhāne guṇināḥ sampratyayaḥ. tad yathā – śuklaḥ, kṛṣṇa iti*, MB. II. i. 1, p. 26

12. Cf. *tatsthaiś ca guṇaiḥ [śaṣṭhiḥ guṇaiḥ] śaṣṭhi samasyata iti vaktavyam, brāhmaṇavarṇaḥ, candanagandhaḥ, paṭoḥśabdaḥ, nadīghoṣoḥ*, *ibid.* II. ii. 8, p. 181.

13. Cf. *yaddhīlam brāhmaṇasya śuklāḥ vṛṣalasya kṛṣṇā ity asāmarthyād atra na bhaviṣyati. katham asāmarthyam? sāpekṣam asamarthanā bhavātīti. dravyamātrāpekṣyate dantīḥ*, *ibid.* p. 181.

14. The elision of *matup* is restricted only to a certain type of quality words is evident by the exclusion of the quality words like *rasa*, *rūpa*, *gandha* and *sparsa* by the rule *rasādibhyaś ca*, V. ii. 95 from the elision of *matup*. Thus *rasavān*, *rūpavān* and *gandhavān* as against *śuklaḥ* or *kṛṣṇaḥ*.

it could correctly be conjectured that the word *guṇavacana* is used in the sense of such quality words like *śukla* (expressive of the quality-as existing in a substance as qualifying it).

As the aim of the grammarian is to explain the forms of the language as found in usage by evolving or employing the notions on the basis of those prevalent within the school of grammar or in other systems of philosophy, different types of explanations are offered to bring out the idea as to how the quality words like *śukla* used in such a way as *śuklaḥ paṭaḥ*, are referring to the quality as existing in a substance. Here he has to explain two grammatical aspects, namely 1) the denotation of the substance by the quality word, and 2) the association of the same number and gender of the substratum to the quality word. The rule *viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ* (I. ii. 52) is interpreted as aimed at prescribing the second aspect.

Bharṭṛhari elucidates what Patañjali has hinted at in his concluding remark and shows how the rule has to be interpreted to squeeze out the intended sense from the rule and how the rule is necessary for all the grammarians of different schools.

At the out set it may be noted that the rule presupposes the grammatical sanction of the denotation of the substance by the quality word like *śukla* which could be possible only by presuming *sāmānādhikarāṇya* or collocation between the quality word and the substance word, as it has been admitted in principle by all that the qualifier and the qualificand in collocation denote the same referent, and both the words agree in gender and number. On the procedural side of the formal grammar as to how the quality word denotes the substance, two explanations are offered in accordance with the *Vṛtti pakṣa* and *Avṛtti-pakṣa*. While the *Vṛtti-pakṣa* explains the denotation of substance by presuming the quality word as a *taddhita* derivative, the *Avṛtti-pakṣa* explains it by putting the quality word in apposition to the substance word in a sentence.

#### *Difference between Vṛtti and Avṛtti pakṣas*

The distinction of *Vṛtti-pakṣa* and *Avṛtti pakṣa* is evolved on the basis of the difference between the meaning conveyed by the *vṛtti-pada* and its parallel, the *vākya*.<sup>15</sup> Even though the *vṛtti pada* and its expanded form of sentence carry similar sense there is a difference, that while the components of a *vṛtti-pada* signify the referent in a gene-

15. *iha dvau pakṣau vṛttipakṣaś cāvṛttipakṣaś ca. svabhāvataś caitad bhavati vākyaṃ ca pratyaś ca*, MB. III. i. 7, p. 39.

See also :

*iha dvau pakṣau vṛttipakṣaś cāvṛttipakṣaś ca svabhāvataś caitad bhavati vākyaṃ ca vṛttiś ca*, ibid. IV. i. 82, p. 104.

ral way, a particular individual is denoted by the same components in a sentence. And the *vṛtti* and *vākya* are of two different categories without any kind of causality between them. The whole argument of the rule I. ii. 52 is based upon justifying the denotation of substance by the quality word like *śukla*. While the *Vṛtti-pakṣa* holds that the word *śukla* denotes the substance in general by treating the word *śukla* as a secondary derivative, the *Avṛtti-pakṣa* views the word as denoting the particular individual. In both the cases the additional use (*anuprayoga*) of the substance word is inevitable, because in the former the substance is denoted in a general way necessitating the use of the particular to fulfil the expectancy<sup>16</sup>. In the latter the word cannot get the capacity to denote the substance unless the substance word is also used in apposition. The substance word could be dropped if it is understood otherwise by the context. Now we shall see how Bhartṛhari explains the rule from these two divergent points of view.

### I. VṚTTI-PAKṢA

The quality word is taken as denoting the additional sense of the substance by *vṛtti* and two types of grammatical explanations are offered<sup>17</sup>, namely

1. The secondary derivative affix *-matuṣ* is added to the quality word in conformity with the rule *tad asyāsty asminṇ iti matuṣ* (V. ii. 94) and is later elided after accomplishing the sense of the possessor of the quality by *ekārthibhāva-sāmarthyā* in accordance with the *vārttika-guṇāvacanebhyo matuṣo luk* (V.ii. 94, Vt.)<sup>18</sup>. As the idea of possessor is always conveyed even after the affix is elided because of the unified sense, it is treated as a secondary derivative.

2. The quality word is treated on a par with the secondary derivative (*taddhita-vṛtti*) in *-matuṣ*.

The difference between the two explanations is only that while the quality word in the former is treated as a secondary derivative by the addition and subsequent elision of the *-matuṣ* affix, in the latter the quality word itself is presumed as a secondary derivative akin to that of the *matuṣ*- ending derivative.

16. *atha vā nedam ubhayaṃ yugapad bhavati vākyaṃ ca pratyayaś ca. yadā vākyaṃ na tadā pratyayaḥ. yadā pratyayaḥ sāmānyena vṛttiḥ. tatrāvaśyaṃ viśeṣārthiṇā viśeṣo 'nuprayoktavyaḥ, ibid. III. i. 8, p. 53.*

17. *sa hi matublopan matvarthīyākārāntatayā vā dravyasāmānye prakrāntaḥ....., HP. III. Vṛ. 135, p. 69.*

18. *Cf. katham punar ayaṃ guṇavacanāḥ san dravyavacanāḥ sampadyate. ārabhyate tatra matublopan 'guṇavacanabhyo matuṣo luk' iti, MB. II. i. 30, p. 98.*

*Explanation of the rule viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ*

To arrive at the sense of the *Bhāṣya* statement the rule is interpreted thus :

The word *viśeṣaṇa* in the rule is not taken in its usual sense of determinant (*bhedakam*)<sup>19</sup>, but in the sense of the quality word like *śukla* and *nīla* used as subordinate (*paratantra*) in *vr̥tti*.<sup>20</sup> The words *yuktavat* and *vyaktivacane* from the preceding rule *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane* (I. ii. 51) are taken to the present rule by *anuvṛtti*. *Yuktavat* refers to the *viśeṣa* or the substance word and *vyaktivacane* refers to the gender and number which are to be enunciated by the rule<sup>21</sup>. The word *ajāteḥ* is to prohibit the transference of number and gender if the *jātivācaka* is used as a *viśeṣaṇa*<sup>22</sup>. And the word *viśeṣaṇa* in the rule is taken as referring to only the quality words. Thus the rule means :

‘the gender and number of the substance word are transferred to the quality word which is subordinated because of its being used as a secondary derivative.’

Here an objection may be raised as to why the quality word should be taken as the *viśeṣaṇa* when it could signify the sense of possessor due to the capacity got by *ekārthibhāva-sāmarthyā* even after the elision of the *taddhita* affix. The answer is that the quality word could denote the possessor in its universal aspect only but not the particular individual. As the expectancy for the particular individual could not be fulfilled unless the substance word is used, the quality word continues to be only a *viśeṣaṇa*.<sup>23</sup>

The pivot of the argument for the necessity of the rule *viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ* depends upon establishing that the denotation of the quality word in *vr̥tti* is only a substance in general (*sāmānya*). The rule could be dispensed with provided the quality word could be maintained as denoting the substance in particular (*viśeṣa*), for, in such a case, the *liṅgavacanātideśa* becomes natural (*svābhāvika*). Hence several *prima facie* observations are put forward to justify the denotation of *viśeṣa*. But Bhartṛhari proves that none of them could stand to logic either

19. *bhedakam viśeṣaṇam iti yady api pratītam tathā, ita paratantramūtram vivakṣitam*, HP. III. Vṛ. 135, p. 69.

20. *parārtham śeṣabhāvam yo vr̥ttiṣu pratipadyate | guṇo viśeṣaṇatvena sa sūtre vyapadiśyate ||* VP. III. Vṛ. 135.

21. *jātibhinnāni yāni viśeṣaṇāni teṣām yuktavat - viśeṣyavad ity arthah, Śabdakaustubha*, I. ii. 52, p. 35, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1929.

22. Cf. *guṇavacanānām udghoṣe 'pi jātibhinnam guṇaśabdārthah*, *ibid*.

23. *yady api cāsyā lupatratyasya viśeṣyavacanatā, tothāpi viśeṣyasāmūnyavṛtītvād viśeṣākāṅkṣitvāt tam prati viśeṣaṇatvam bhavaty eva*, HP. III. Vṛ. 135, p. 69

according to the *Padāvadāhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa* or *Vākyaṣādhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa*.<sup>24</sup>

*Difference between the Padāvadāhikānvākhyāna and Vākyaṣādhikānvākhyāna pakṣas*

*Padāvadāhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa* views the word as the basic element of speech and the sentence is constructed by arranging the words after modifying them in conformity with the rules of grammar so as to suit to the concordance in a sentence. On the other hand, as a contrast, the *Vākyaṣādhikānvākhyāna pakṣa* holds the sentence as the basic unit of thought communication and the words are grammatically modified in conformity with the syntactical relation (*saṃsarga*) after they are imbedded in a sentence. These two views represent the *Abhihitānvaya-vāda* and *Anvitābhidhāna-vāda* respectively from the grammatical side of interpretation.

Now we shall examine as to how the rule becomes indispensable for both the *Padāvadāhikānvākhyāna* and *Vākyaṣādhikānvākhyāna vādās*.

*Padāvadāhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa*

According to this view, the quality word by the addition of the *-matuṣ* affix denotes only the possessor of the quality in general because at its formative stage, it is not clear with which it would be syntactically related in a sentence. The quality word, consequently, is treated on a par with neuter pronoun *tat* and the neuter singular case-affix is added in conformity with the dictum *sāmānye napuṃsakam*.<sup>25</sup> For example the word *śuklaḥ* (masc sing) becomes *śuklam* (neu. sing) in the sense of the possessor of the white colour. And when it is in concordance with the word *paṭaḥ* (masc. pl) the resultant expression would be *śuklam paṭaḥ* as against the accepted expression *śuklāḥ paṭaḥ*.

Here as the addition of the neuter singular is *antaraṅga* with reference to the addition of the masculine plural the *lingavacanātideśa* could not be enforced in conformity with the dictum *pūrvāparanīṭyāntaraṅgāpavādānām uttarottaram balīyaḥ*.<sup>26</sup> As a result in order to nullify

24. These two views are also called *Vākyasamśkāra-pakṣa* and *Padasamśkāra-pakṣa* respectively. Ref. *Śabdaratna*, the commentary on *Praughamanoramā*, VIII, iv. 64, vol. I, p. 264. Kāshī Sanskrit Series No. 125, Benares, 1937.

25. *iha padāvadāhike 'nvākhyāne padāntarānapekṣayā pade saṃskriyamāṇe niyata-vākya-gataviśeṣānvadhārāṇāt sāmānye svārthamātre liṅgasarvanāmanapuṃsaka-yogāt saṃkhyāsarvanāmābhedaikatvayogāc ca śuklam iti pade sthite* .... HP. III Vṛ. 134, p. 67.

26. .... *śuklam iti pade sthite, paṭā iti padāntarasamanvayopajane 'py abhinirvṛtasya uttarāṅgasya saṃskārasya nirvṛtteḥ paṭā ity asamanvītārthatvād asamānādhikarāṇe 'pi prayoge prāpte 'viśeṣaṇānam cōjāteḥ' iti viśiṣṭalīṅgasamkhyā-siddhyartham ārabhyate śīṣṭam*, ibid.

the dictum an *apavāda* (exceptional) rule become necessary for which purpose the present rule is aimed.<sup>27</sup>

### *Vākyāvadāhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa*

As this view holds that the *vṛtti* is formed after the sense of the whole sentence is complete, it could be questioned as to why the *vṛtti-pada* according to this school cannot be denotative of a particular individual? For example when the *vṛtti-pada* could be formed from the analytical sentence *śuklo guṇo 'sya pṛṭṭasya asti*, why not the derivative *śukla* be denotative of not only the general sense of the possessor, but also the particular *paṭa*? Patañjali himself suggests the answer. It could not be maintained that the *vṛtti* could denote exactly the same sense with all its particularities as is expressed by the sentence.<sup>28</sup> As the derivative is commonly applicable to many a particular, it could not be expressive of any single individual.<sup>29</sup> Thus irrespective of the individual, say *paṭa*, being expressed by the analytical sentence, the derivative *śukla* denotes only the possessor of the white colour in general. So the rule is as much indispensable as is for the *Padāvādhikānvākhyāna-pakṣa*.

A feeble argument for ousting the rule I. ii 52 is suggested on two grounds. Firstly, the particularity (*viśeṣa*) could be taken for the association of number and gender even though it is not denoted by the *viśeṣaṇ*: on the ground that the *sāmānya* that is denoted could abide only in a particular individual. Secondly, because of the incompatibility in concordance due to the difference in case endings, the *viśeṣaṇa* gets the same number and gender superseding the dictum *pūrvāparanītyāntaraṅgāpavādānām uttarottaram bālīyaḥ*<sup>30</sup>

But neither of the reasons alluded for ousting the rule could stand to logic because they do not go in conformity with the principles of interpretation. Firstly, as Hārāja observes, the grammatical modifications like adding the case-affix are governed by the sense actually denoted by a word directly.<sup>31</sup> So even though the particular individual is desired to be expressed by the secondary derivative it denotes only the general (*sāmānya*). Thus the gender and number pertaining to

27. *abhede līngasamkhyābhyām yogā- chuklam paṭā iti | prasakte śāstram ārabdham siddhaye līngasamkhyayoh ||* VP. III. Vṛ. 134.

28. Ref. fn. 16 above.

29. *śabdāntaratvād vākyeṣu viśeṣa yady api śrutāḥ | vṛtter abhinna-rūpatvāt teṣu vṛttir na vidyate ||* VP. III. Vṛ. 136.

30. *nanv evam api niyataviśeṣanīṣṭhasyaiva sāmānyasya pratipādyatvād anirdhārito 'pi viśeṣo bhaviṣyaty anvākhyānanimittam, samānvayānyathānupapatyā vā bahi- raṅgam apy āśrayalīngasamkhyam pratīkṣiṣyate*, HP. ibid. 137, p. 70.

1. *iha yo 'rthaḥ śabdāt pratīyate, sa eva samskāranimittam*, ibid.



*sāmānya*, namely neuter singular, alone have the chance of application.<sup>32</sup> And when it is syntactically related with the substance word possessing some particular number and gender the two words differ in their number and gender.<sup>33</sup> Secondly the dictum *pūrvāpara*.....could not be superseded without the aid of an *apavāda* rule.<sup>34</sup> Hence the rule is a must according to the *Vākyaavadhikānvākhyāna* view also.

#### *Denotative sense of a secondary derivative*

Why should the derivative denote the *sāmānya*? Had it been admitted as denoting the *viśeṣa* there would not have been any necessity for a rule like I. ii. 52. But we have already noticed that even though the derivative is grammatically approved as denoting *viśeṣa*, it could not be comprehended because the derivative is identical in form with reference to many an individual. Thus Bhartṛhari observes that the deficiency of the derivative to denote the *viśeṣa* is natural, because the referent of a word could be *viśeṣa* only when it could eliminate all other particularities<sup>35</sup>.

An objection is raised that even when the *viśeṣa* is not denoted, the grammatical modifications to the derivative, like *lingavacanātidēśa* dependent upon the *viśeṣa*, could be carried out on the ground that the *viśeṣa* is invariably associated (*sāhacarya*) with the *sāmānya* and that the *sāmānya* cannot exist without *viśeṣa*. In such a case the rule I. ii. 52 could also be dropped. The reply is that it would be true if the *viśeṣa* were to coexist and be comprehended along with the *sāmānya*. But in fact the *sāmānya* excludes the *viśeṣa* also because when a particular sense becomes the referent of a word it automatically excludes all other referents<sup>36</sup>. Thus Bhartṛhari remarks that *sāmānya* itself functions like a *viśeṣa* in so far as eliminating any other *sāmānya* or *viśeṣa*.<sup>37</sup> The *sāmānya* is here called *viśeṣa* by applying the general definition of *viśeṣa* namely 'exclusion' (*vyāvṛtti*)<sup>38</sup>. But on that score the *sāmānya* should not be equated with *viśeṣa* and argued that the derivative could

- 
- |     |  |                   |
|-----|--|-------------------|
| 32. | <i>rūpāc ca śabdasaṃskāraḥ sāmānyaviśayaḥ yataḥ  <br/>tasmāt tadāśrāyaṃ līṅgaṃ vacanaṃ ca prasajyate   </i>  | VP. III. Vṛ. 137. |
| 33. | <i>saṅgamaḥ ca sasaṅkhyāḥ ca tato dravyāḥ idhāyinaḥ  <br/>sambaddhyate padam tatra tayoḥ bhinnā śrūtiḥ bhavet   </i>   | ibid. 138.        |
| 34. | <i>bhāvino bahiraṅgasya vacanād āśrayasya ye  <br/>līṅgasamkhye guṇānāṃ te sūtreṇa pratipāditē   </i>  | ibid. 139.        |
| 35. | <i>viśeṣavṛtter api ca rūpābhedaḥ alakṣitaḥ  <br/>yasmād viśeṣas tenātra bhedakāryaṃ na kalpate   </i>   | ibid. 140.        |
| 36. | <i>yad yadāśrīyate tat tadanyasya vinivartakam  </i>   | ibid. 142.        |
| 37. | <i>viśeṣa eva sāmānyam viśeṣād bhidyate yataḥ  <br/>abhedo hi viśeṣānām āśrito vinivartakam   </i>   | ibid. 141.        |
| 38. | <i>iha vyāvṛttiḥ viśeṣalakṣaṇam. parasparam vyāvartamānā hi viśeṣāḥ kathyante.<br/>tathā ca sāmānyam apy abhedanāśritam viśeṣānām nivartakatvād viśeṣo bhavati,<br/>HP. ibid. p. 71.</i> |                   |

not even be associated with neuter singular in conformity with the dictum *sāmānye napuṃsakam*. It is because the distinction of either absolute exclusion (*bheda*) or absolute nonexclusion (*abheda*) could be proved in the case of *sāmānya*.<sup>39</sup> For example the *sāmānya* could not be absolutely exclusive because it exists in all its substrata simultaneously without any reference to a particular individual while excluding other *sāmānyas*.<sup>40</sup> In the same way it could not be nonexclusive because it excludes all the *viśeṣas* and other *sāmānyas*.<sup>41</sup> To be a *viśeṣaṇa* it must be absolutely exclusive of other *viśeṣas* and *sāmānyas*.

#### *Difference between sāmānya and viśeṣa*

The difference between the *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa* is mainly due to the place where the word occurs in a sentence. It is only in a sentence the words get a specialised sense by force of their syntactic relation and mutual determination. In fact every word is denotative of *sāmānya* as well as *viśeṣa*. When pulled out of a sentence, the word standing independently can denote only a general sense, *sāmānya*.<sup>42</sup> The same word being determined by some adjuncts in a sentence gives rise to the definite sense, *viśeṣa*. Just as a person standing alone at a distance could not be definitely identified, the *viśeṣa* could not be comprehended unless determined by some adjuncts.<sup>43</sup> Therefore Bhartṛhari remarks that the *viśeṣas* themselves are designated *sāmānyas* when they could not be comprehended, and the *sāmānyas* themselves are manifested as *viśeṣas* when they are determined by some adjuncts.<sup>44</sup> For example in the expression *gauḥ śuklo gacchati*, a particular individual cow is signified because the referent of the word *go* is determined by the *jāti* of cowhood, *guṇa* of white colour and *krīyā* of going.<sup>45</sup>

#### *Conclusion*

The quality word, being not determined by any adjunct in *vṛtti*, denotes only the possessor in general demanding neuter singular case-

39. *bhedābhedavibhāgas tu sāmānye na nirūpyate*, VP. ibid. 142.

40. *evam api ca sāmānyam bheda iti nocyate, sāmānyāntarāṇām apākaraṇena svāśra-yeṣv anuvṛtteḥ*, HP. ibid. p. 71.

41. *nāpy abheda iti śakyate nirūpayitum, niyataviśeṣāṇām sāmānyāntarāṇām ca vyāvartakatvāt*, ibid.

42. *apoddhāraś ca sāmānyam iti tasyopakāriṇaḥ | nimittāvastham evātas tat svadharmeṇa grhyate ||* VP. ibid. 143.

43. *durād api rūpamātreṇa vyaktau naivāvasīyate*, HP. ibid. 144, p. 72.

44. *anīrdhāritadharmatvād bhedā eva vikalpitāḥ | nimittair vyapadiśyante sāmānyākhyāviśeṣitāḥ ||* VP. ibid. 144.  
Cf. *sāmānyaśabdāś ca nāntareṇa prakaraṇam viśeṣaṇam vū viśeṣeṣv avatiṣṭhante*, MB. I. iii. 1, p. 163.

45. *yataś ca jātiḥ guṇakriyālakṣaṇair nimittair upādhibhir avacchinṇā gauḥ śuklo gacchati tyādirūpeṇa te vyapadiśyante, tato bhedā evaivaṃ rūpā iti niśchīyante* HP. III. Vṛ. 144, p. 72.

affix and consequently the rule I. ii. 52 becomes obligatory for the change of its case-affix in conformity with the substance word.<sup>46</sup>

## II AVṚTTI-PAKṢA

According to this view the *sāmānādhikaraṇya* or collocation is brought about between the quality and substance by identifying the quality with substance through superimposition of the latter on the former as in the well-known example *so 'yam* in which a thing observed in two different circumstances is identified as 'this is that' (*so'yamityabhisambandha*). Thus the quality word denotes the same referent as denoted by the substance word. As a result the transference of number and gender of the substance to the quality is natural.<sup>47</sup> And it is only in a sentence the quality word gets this additional denotement.<sup>48</sup> As the relation between the quality and substance is that of identity, the quality word is not treated in this view as a secondary derivative because *vr̥tti* or the addition of *matup* affix is based on the notion of difference between the possessor and the possessed. Consequently the problem of the denotation of the *sāmānya* by the quality word or the question of the association of number and gender being *antaraṅga* or *bahiraṅga* does not arise as in the *Vṛtti-pakṣa*.<sup>49</sup> Thus difference between the *Avṛtti-pakṣa* and *Vṛtti-pakṣa* is that the *līṅgavacanātidṣa* is natural in one but grammatical in the other.

### Purpose of the rule in the *Avṛtti-pakṣa*

Now it is a relevant question as to why the rule I. ii. 52 should be read when the gender and number could be secured natural by bringing out an identity between the quality and substance through superimposition? It is a fact that there is no necessity for a rule according to *so'yamityabhisambandha* view, because in the *svābhāvīkapaṅkṣa* the grammatical rule can neither add nor diminish any sense than to reiterate (*anuvāda*) what is already current in usage. Patañjali mentions that the superimposition of a thing in another is possible in four senses, namely one being the locus for the other (*tātsithya*), having similar attributes

46. *evam ca kṛtvā līṅgavacanāni siddhāni bhavanti. śuklaṃ vastram, śuklā śāī, śuklāḥ kambalāḥ, śuklau kambalau, śuklāḥ kambalā iti. yad asau dravyam śrito bhavati guṇas tasya yallīṅgaṃ vacanam ca tadguṇasjāpi bhavati*, MB. V. ii. 94, p. 414.

47. Cf. *so'yamityabhisambandhād viśiṣṭāśrayavācīnām | śuklādīval līṅgasamkhye śāstrārambhād bhaviṣyataḥ ||* VP. III. Vṛ. 223

48. *yadā tu vyapadiṣyete līṅgasamkhye svābhāvataḥ || prayogeṣv eva sādhutvaṃ vākye prakramyate tadā !* ibid. 145.

49. *tad evam pūrvam vicchedopakrame 'nvūkhyāne guṇaguṇīnor bhedaṃ āśrītya taddhitaprayoge saty āśrayasāmānye vṛtter antaraṅgo līṅgasamkhyāsarvanāma-yoga uktāḥ, idānīm tu so 'yom iti sambandhāśrayeṇābhedaṃ āśrītya prathamata eva niyatavākyaopāttaviśeṣavṛttitā kathitā. tathā cātra bhedasambandhābhāvān matupo.. ..*, HP. ibid. p. 73.

(*tāddharmya*), being in proximity (*tatsāmīpya*) and having co-existence (*sāhacarya*)<sup>50</sup>. When the identity is brought in between any two words through superimposition, the number and gender of the superimposed are not uniformly transferred to the substratum of superimposition. In some places the principle of *nimittānuvidhāna*<sup>51</sup> is adhered and thus the attributes of *nimitta* are also retained even after superimposing another thing (*nimittin*). Thus due to the continuance of the attributes of the *nimitta* the suffixes similar to those of the *nimitta* are added because the attributes of the *nimittin* are obscured. For example in the expression *mañcān yuvatīḥ paśya* the word *mañcān* (masc. pl.) being in apposition with *yuvatīḥ* (fem. pl.) brought by superimposing the sense of *yuvati* on *mañca* in the sense of *tātsihya* because the ladies are seated in cushions, does not change its gender and number in conformity with its qualificant. On the other hand, the principle of *nimittānuvidhāna* is not adhered<sup>52</sup>. For example the word *praṣṭhī*, 'the wife of a chieftain' is found in usage with the association of the gender and number of the superimposed referent. The masculine word *praṣṭha* forsakes its gender and number when the sense of wife is superimposed in the sense of *tātsāhacarya* on the referent of *praṣṭha*.<sup>53</sup> Thus there is a diversity in the transference of gender and number in the cases of superimposition. In fact the diversity of this type is only due to the very nature of words (*śabdaśakti-svābhāvya*)<sup>54</sup>.

As to the purpose served by the rules of grammar, it is only to differentiate the diverse occurrences of varying nature but not to enjoin any grammatical modifications<sup>55</sup>. Thus, Bhartṛhari observes that the enunciation of the feminine affix *nīs* to the words like *praṣṭha* by the rule *pūṁyogād ākhyāyām* (IV. i 48) is the *jñāpaka* that the masculine word forsakes its gender when it is employed through *so'yamityabhisambandha* or superimposition to denote the feminine gender<sup>56</sup>. The rule *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane* (I. ii. 51) is to show that in the formations

50. *katham punar atasmin 'sa' ity etad bhavati? caturbhiḥ prakārair atasmin 'sa' ity etad bhavati - tāsthyāt, tāddharmyāt, tatsāmīpyāt, tatsāhacaryād iti*, MB. IV. i. 48, p. 73.

51. *nimittād - nimittavatyarthē, nimittasarūpaḥ pratyayo jāyate*, HP. III. Vṛ. 153, p. 77.

According to the principle of *nimittānuvidhāna* the *nimitta* is considered as predominant and the attributes like number and gender of the *nimitta* are transferred to the *nimittin* also.

52. *tatra mañcān yuvatīḥ paśya vāsāṁsi vetyatra mañcaśabdaḥ tāsthyāt samāropya-māno 'jahatsvaliṅgasamkhyā eva vartate svādheye*, ibid 150, p. 75.

53. *āveśo liṅgasamkhyābhyām kvacin mañcādivat sthitaḥ | so'yamityabhisambandhe sa praṣṭhātau na vidyate ||* VP. ibid. 150.

54. Cf. *eṣa ca śabdaśaktisvābhāvyaṇ niyamo viśayavibhāgena siddhaḥ*, HP. ibid. p. 76.

55. *ākhyāyate ca śāstreṇa lokarūḍhā svabhāvataḥ |* VP. ibid. 154.

56. *liṅgam liṅgaparityāge sūtre pratyayaśāsanam | so'yamityabhisambandhāt pūṁśabde stiyabhidhīyini ||* ibid. 151

like *godau* the gender and number of the *nimitta* alone are associated to the *nimittin* in conformity with the principle of *nimittānuvidhāna*.<sup>57</sup> And the *vārttikas* 1) *haritakyādiṣu vyaktiḥ* and 2) *khalatikādiṣu vacanam* are to supplement that the *nimittānuvidhāna* is partially applied in some select instances. Thus in the examples *haritakyāḥ phalāni* and *khalatikam vanāni* the number and gender of the *nimitta*, namely the feminine gender of *haritaki* and singular number of *khalatikam* are retained respectively in conformity with *nimittānuvidhāna*.<sup>58</sup> And the number of *phalāni* and gender of *vanāni* are transferred to the *nimitta* respectively. Similarly the *vārttika* - *manuṣyalupi pratiṣedhaḥ* is to affirm that the application of *nimittānuvidhāna* in the instances like *cāncā abhirūpaḥ*, 'the delightful straw figure of man' and *vadhrikā darśanīyaḥ*, 'a beautiful representation of an eunuch' is an exception to the rule I. ii. 52.<sup>59</sup>

As regards the purpose served by the rule I. ii. 52, Bhartṛhari declares that it is by specification of the rule, the substratum with its number and gender is denoted by the quality word.<sup>60</sup> And secondly the rule dismisses the idea that the quality word carries its gender and number through the adherence of the principle of *nimittānuvidhāna*.<sup>61</sup> Otherwise a chance may arise that the quality word like *śukla* being used in the sense of its substratum without discarding its gender or number or both on analogy with the words like *khalatika*, *mañca* and *viṃśati*.<sup>62</sup>

Therefore the rule I. ii. 52 is indispensable according to the *Aṣṭi-pakṣa* also.

### Summary

The rule I. ii. 52 prescribes the transference of gender and number of the *dravya-vacana* (substance word) to the *guṇa-vacana* (quality word) when they are in collocation. According to the *Aṣṭi-pakṣa* the *liṅga-vacanātideśa* is *svābhāvika* and the rule is only to positively guide the places of divergence. And in the *Vṛtti-pakṣa* either according to the *Padāvadhikānvākhyāna* or *Vākyāvadhikānvākhyāna* view—the two different explanations as to how the words are modified evolved on the basis of the *Abhihitānvaya-vāda* and *Anvitābhidhāna-vāda*—the *liṅgavacanātideśa* is *vācanika* or grammatical.

57. *nimittatulyā godādu pravṛttir liṅgasamkhyayoḥ* | ibid. 154.

58. *haritakyādiṣu vyaktiḥ samkhyā khalatikādiṣu* | ibid. 155.

59. *manuṣyalubviṣeṣāṇām abhidheyāśrayaṃ dvayam* | ibid.

60. *āśraye liṅgasamkhyābhyām āśritaṃ vyapadiśyate | viṣeṣaṇānām cājāter iti śāstravyavasthayaḥ* || ibid. 152.

61. *nimittānuvidbālyitvād ye dharmā bhedaheṭuṣu | ta āśraye 'pi vidyanta iti buddhīr nīvartyate* || ibid. 153.

62. The word *viṃśati* (fem. sing.) as in the example *viṃśatir brāhmaṇāḥ* does not leave both its number and gender even when it is in collocation with its qualificant.

*Conclusion*

The rule I. ii. 52 when interpreted in the sense of *guṇavacanānāṃ śabdānāṃ āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti* becomes indispensable to any system of thinking. As to the relative merits or the acceptability of one theory over the other, Bhartṛhari is not concerned with it, because his chief aim is not to establish any particular school but only to study the problems on linguistic phenomena threadbare and to evaluate the statements of Patañjali.

Dr. RAM DUTT SHARMA

## REVERENCE TO GOD IN THE JAIVANSH

India is a religious country where the reverence to God has always played the important role in social life. The God-worship has been the religious symbol of ancient civilisation of the country. In Indian-religion, called *dharma*, the four ends of human-life are still very popular, namely *dharma* (religion), *artha* (wealth), *kāma* (wordly desire) and *mokṣa* (the salvation), out of which *dharma* is the first and the blessed one.

The *Jaivansh Mahākāvya*, the historical work, was composed by one Mr. Sita Ram Chaturvedi of Parvanicar caste in which a poetic description of the Princes of Amber since Prince Sodhdev (1023 Vikram Era) to King Madho Singh I (1800 A D.) of the Kachawaha clan of Sūrya-vaṃśi sect has been given.

When we go through this work, i.e. the *Jaivansh* epic, we may trace out the vivid description of several deities or gods and goddesses in it. This description indicates the religious belief of the people in these gods and goddesses and also in the temples, i.e. the places of worship.

From the very first canto of the work we realise the devotion of the princess toward the gods and religion. Here we would like to give the descriptive account of these temples of gods and goddesses based on the *Jaivansh* :

### *Goddess Yamava or Jamava*

It was Prince Durlabha, son of Prince Sodhdev, who got constructed the temple of Goddess Yamava or Jamava situated about a furlong away from the present Dam of Jamva Ramgarh. It is described in this work that when Prince Durlabha conquered Dausa, he proceeded toward Machi where the village warriors fought bravely and the Prince was

badly injured<sup>1</sup> by them. At night he heard the words, "Get up Oh Son!" and he awoke at once and prayed the goddess who was before him.<sup>2</sup>

"Oh Mother! with kindness and searching eyes,  
I am under the shelter of your feet.  
I bow thee Oh Mother! but cannot praise,  
as even the gods cannot do so....."

On this prayer the Goddess was pleased with him and asked him to erect her statue, named Yamava, on the bank of River Banganga and worship her there to be victorious in this battle.<sup>3</sup> Prince Durlabha asked the goddess how that would be possible when his whole army had been almost destroyed by the enemies. At the moment the Mother blessed him with the divine-power of touch to get his dead army awakened at the battle field. And then, the Mother disappeared.<sup>4</sup> Afterwards the Prince did whatever the Mother told and won that battle.<sup>5</sup>

The temple of Goddess Yamava is still standing near the Dam Jamva Ramgarh and due to lapse of time the word *yamava* changed as '*jamava*' and the nearby village as well as the dam are now being called 'Jamava Ramgarh'.

#### *Goddess Amba - Shilā Devi*

King Man Singh I of Amber (Jaipur) was one of the bravest administrators of his time. He fought many battles in his life and their description is available in detail in the canto VII of the *Jaiवंश*.<sup>6</sup> When King Man Singh was on the march of conquest, he reached Bengal. But it was very difficult to win the King Kedar of Bengal. At night he prayed the Goddess who appeared before him<sup>7</sup> and advised him to fight for victory. In the morning a fierce battle was fought and King Man Singh was victorious.<sup>8</sup> But meanwhile the statue of the goddess was stolen away by King Kedar and was thrown into the river. King Man Singh was sad and sorry on this event, but at night the Goddess appeared again in the dream and told him how King Kedar threw the statue in the river. She advised him to search out the statue and to install it in his own city. King Man Singh searched out the statue from the river and brought it to Amber and installed there in a magnificent temple.<sup>9</sup> The detailed description of this grand temple is given by the poet in his work.

- 
1. *Jaiवंश*, 1.26.
  2. *ibid.* 1.28.
  3. *ibid.* 1.32.
  4. *ibid.* 1.33, 34.
  5. *ibid.* 1.37, 38.
  6. *ibid.* 7.16, 23.
  7. *ibid.* 7.73.
  8. *ibid.* 7.84.
  9. *ibid.* 7.87



In the *Jaivansh*, the word *ambā*, 'the mother', has been used, but the goddess is now famous as *Shilā Devī* in the grand temple at *Ambāpuri*, i.e. now *Amber*. There is a famous saying prevalent in the people of *Jaipur* which means :

"The God *Saṅga* of *Saṅganer*,  
The God *Hanumān* of *Jaipur*,  
The Mother *Shilā Devī* of *Amber*,  
Brought by King *Man* with honour."<sup>10</sup>

Hence the *Ambāpuri* is called now *Amber* whereas *Ambā* is now called *Shilā Devī*. Describing the old parts of *Jaipur* city in the Canto XIX of the *Jaivansh*, the poet has referred the mother *Ambā* at several places.<sup>11</sup> Even today the *Ambā Shilā Devī* is the family-goddess of the Royal family of *Jaipur*. It is a place worth seeing where special offerings are presented in the *Navarātri* period of reverence.

#### *Viśveśvara Mahādeva: Lord of the Universe*

The name of king *Sawai Jaisingh II* will remain for ever in the memory of the generations as a scholar, artist and brave king of *Jaipur* State. He was a great devotee too. The poet says that the temples were there in countless number. There is a detailed poetic description of *Viśveśvara* Temple got constructed by King *Sawai Jaisingh II*.<sup>12</sup> In canto XIX of the work, the description of this temple has been once repeated and said that this temple is attractive as well as the source of victory and welfare of the Kings.<sup>13</sup>

The temple of *Viśveśvara Mahādeva* is still in good condition and is situated near the city palace. It is constructed with the white marble stones and there are statues of God *Gaṇeśa*, Mother *Pārvatī*, God *Kālabhairava* and *Nandi* – the godly bull along with lord *Śiva*.

#### *The Kalki Temple*

The poet has described another famous temple in his work named *Kalki* Temple constructed during the regime of King *Jaisingh*. The poet says that God *Kalki*, who is the destroyer of the evil souls and is the redeemer of the public and the King, looks toward the Palace.<sup>14</sup> At present this temple is situated in the *Siredyodi Bazar* of *Jaipur* city facing the City Palace, as described by poet.

10. *Sanganer ko Sanga Baboo, Jaipur-ka-Hanuman, Amber ki Shila Devl, Laya Raja Man.*

11. *Jaivansh*, 19.91

12. *ibid.* 19.49

13. *ibid.* 19.58

14. *ibid.* 12.50

*Lord Govinda*

The poet refers to the temple of Lord Govinda in canto XII of his work in detail.<sup>15</sup>

Originally the idol of Lord Govinda was at Vrindavan, but to avoid the destruction from the attack of Mughal Emperor Aurangzab, it was brought to Jaipur.<sup>16</sup> The poet has described this temple once again in canto XIX of the work.<sup>17</sup> At present this temple is situated in the north of the City Palace and a huge number of devotees from Jaipur City visit it daily for the prayers and sight of Lord Govinda.

*Gālavāsrama - Galtaji*

In the canto XII of the *Jaivansh* the poet has given a fine description of the hermitage of Ṛṣi Gālava which is situated on the hill side.<sup>18</sup> In the last canto of the work, the poet again refers this hermitage where water is falling from the marble-cow-head into the tank.

This hermitage of Ṛṣi Gālava is now called Galtaji and is being regarded as a place of pilgrimage in Jaipur.

It is a famous saying that a King of Jaipur was on a hunting expedition in this area and he hurt a lion with his arrow. But unfortunately that was a sage in disguise of a lion, who cursed the King to a leper. Really it happened to the King and he was very sad and sorry on this event. While wandering in the jungle, he met another sage and bowed to him with disgust and misery. The sage was so kind hearted that he blessed the King and advised him to construct a water tank there and take bath in it. Then the sage disappeared. Then the king immediately got constructed a big tank with a marble-cow-head for the falling water. He bathed regularly in that tank and day by day the signs of leprosy vanished and he was hale and healthy.

At present this place, known as Galtaji is situated in the East of Jaipur City out side Surajpol Gate. There are two main reservoirs, many small tanks and the cow-head fall.

*The Temple of Lord Sun (Sūrya-mandira)*

In the West of Galtaji, there is a magnificent temple of Lord Sun (Sūrya) on the peak of a hill. It is just in the East of the city of Jaipur. It is said that the kings used to pray Lord Sun after bathing at Galtaji. It is surprising that we do not find the reference of this

15. *ibid.* 12.66

16. *Kalyāṇa-Tīrthaṅka*, p. 279.

17. *Jaivansh*, 19.65

18. *ibid.* 12.93

temple in the *Jaivansh* epic. But it is certainly a part of Galtaji – the abode of sage Gālava.

*Hanumān Temple of Ghat*

The poet describes this temple of Hanumān as the source of fulfilling the longings of the people who worship him with *Curma*, a preparation made of wheat flour and sugar.<sup>19</sup> On every tuesday the devotees visit this temple in large number.

At present this temple is situated on the approach road between Galtaji and Agra-Bharatpur Road near Ghat Gate. This is a very lonely but a beautiful place where a small perennial water-fall adds to its beauty. On the anniversary of the birth-day of Hanmān, a large fair is held here.

Besides all these temples, there are many other temples of Lord Paraśurāma, Hanumān of Sanganer, etc., which have the reference in this work. This vivid description gives us the glimpses of the religious feelings and reverence to Gods and Goddesses in that time. These temples are the historic monuments of our culture and civilisation which need protection from the masses as well as from the Government.



## REVIEWS

1. *ŚRĪPRAŚNASAMHITĀ*, edited by Mrs. Seetha Padmanabhan with the Foreword by Dr. V. Raghavan. Published by Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha. Tirupati. 1969. R + LXXXXVI + 522 pp.

The *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* play a significant role in the religious life of the Vaiṣṇavas. They contain prescriptions for the ways of life, particularly for the acts of worshipping the deity in the house and temple. The antiquity of the *Samhitās* which are the texts representing these *Āgamas*, cannot be questioned as indicated in the valuable Foreword. However it is found that most of them assumed their present shape at a very late period in South India. The date of the *Samhitā* under review in its present form shall be placed after Rāmānuja (A.D. 1017-1137) whose concept of *śeṣaśeṣibhāva* is referred to in Ch. XVII. 6.

The *Śrīprasānasamhitā* is in the form of answers given by Nārāyaṇa to the questions put to him by Śrī. It is an important text, next only to the *Pādmāsamhitā* for the valuable information it contains on matters like sub-basements (*upapiṭha*), types of *vimānas*, *prākāras* and *maṇḍapas* (Ch. VIII-X). Interesting and useful details are given regarding the size of the idol, the proportion of its each limb to the whole figure and the size of the six *beras* in their mutual relation. The sacred *saṃskāra* called *Pañcasamskāra* (Ch. XVI) and the Pāñcarātric division of the daily routine known as *Pāñcakālavidhi* (Ch. XVII) receive a lucid exposition. The ritualistic aspect of *Śrījayanti* (Ch. XLI) and *Kṛttikādīpa* (Ch. XLIV) is vividly treated. The account which is contained here for the latter which is also called as *Dipotsava* differs from that found in the *Padmapurāṇa* (III. ch. 3). The river Gaṅgā is said to have branched off into seven streams, while it descended from Śiva's head. The names given here for the streams are those of seven sacred rivers that are invoked during bath by the pious Hindu in modern days (XLII. 8), while they are given differently in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*Bālakāṇḍa*, XLIII. 12-15).

This *Samhitā* gives elaborate details (Ch. III) for doing *bhaktiyoga* through which *mokṣa* is to be attained. *Jñānins* and *yogins* did not know the *arca* form in very ancient times. The *arcā* form of worship is recommended as the easy course for adoption even for the great (Ch. IV. 5-10). The path of self-surrender is also recommended as a safe course for *mokṣa* (Ch. LIII). The word *sālagrāva* occurs in this *Samhitā* (Ch. XXIX. 114) in the place of the word *sālogrāma* which is worshipped in the houses.

The Introduction is valuable for its informative contents and for the number of appendices for the *mudrās*, musical melodies, *tāla*, musical instruments and dance-poses. The list of the Vedic *mantras* cited in this *Samhitā* is given along with the sources from which they are taken. A list of passages which are of common occurrence in this and other *Samhitās* is helpful for a comparative study of the *Samhitās*.

One wishes the editor had given references to the pages in the sources referred to on pp. X, XIII, XIV, etc. Some of the appendices would have been enriched by giving references to other *Samhitās* which treat the corresponding topics, e.g. on pp. XLII, XLIII, XLVIII-LI. If *Sadādeva* is a proper name as mentioned on p. 519 of the *Anukramaṇikā*, then this word must have occurred as a compound on p. 146 śloka 41. *Viśākhayūpa* (Ch. XXIV. 13) which is referred to in this *Samhitā* and *nirmālya* (Ch. XLIX. 67) could have received a brief note for their description and importance. The readings given in the footnote on some pages should have been preferred for the text, e.g. pp. 6-9a; 24-47a; 24-135a; 29-183a; 52-24a; 52-75a; 52-116b. An index of half verses in smaller type is required in the publications of works like these.

Two statements which are found in the Introduction are of questionable nature. They seem to be inaccurate also. The first of them (p. IV) runs thus:— “While the followers of *Pāñcarātra* hold that the Brahman is all in all, the followers of the *Vaikhānasa* school hold that such a Brahman is but an entity leading to the attributeless Brahman, which alone is the one Reality, everything else being only its manifestation. This view of the *Vaikhānasa* is more akin to the *Advaita* and hence does not find much favour with the *Śrīvaiṣṇavas*”. The editor does not refer to the source of this statement nor does she give the authority for it. In all probability, a reference could be made to Ch. L. 2-4 and Ch. LI. 2. That this is not the view of *Vaikhānasas* is clear from Ch. 86 of the *Matcipaṭala*. Besides, a concept close to this is held by the *Pāñcarātra* school also. Vide: *Lakṣmītantra*, Ch. II. 11; *Sanat-kumārasaṃhitā* - *Rṣirātra*, Ch. 3. 41 & 93 and *Paramāgamacūḍamaṇi*, Ch. 5. On this account, the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* have not ceased to find much favour with the *Śrīvaiṣṇavas*. Besides, the word *vivarta* does not suggest the *Advaitic* tinge, as in the next lines, Brahman is referred to

*sadguṇātūrā* (Ch. LI. 2). The other passage on the same page runs thus: "And this school would have had no following at all among the Śrī-vaiṣṇavas but for its acknowledgement of the supreme Being as the Lord of Lakṣmī, and is possessing all the attributes". This statement draws the conclusion which is the opposite of the contents of the previous passage. Besides, those alone who are followers of the *Vaikhānasa-sūtra* by birth are eligible for following of the *Vaikhānasa* text and do worship to the deities in the temples which are governed by the *Vaikhānasa Āgama*. Vide: *Atrisamhitā-Somūrtanārcanādhikāra*, Ch. II; *Kriyādhikāra* (Bhṛgu), I. 22 to 25, XXXV. 27 & 28. On the other hand, the *Pāñcarātra* teachings are open to the members of all the castes. Vide: *Mahābhārata-Bhīṣmaparvan*. LXVI. 39, 40; *Sāttvaśaṃhitā*, II-11 and *Śrīprasnaśaṃhitā*, IV. 15 & XVI. 27 to 30. It is also desirable to note here that while initiation of a special kind (*dikṣāvīṣeṣa*) is enjoined in both the kinds of *Āgamas* on those who have to do worship to the *arcā* form of God, the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* enjoin an initiation of a general kind on all without any distinction. Thus giving them the *adhikāra* follow their teachings. Vide: *Lakṣmitantra*, Ch. XLI; *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*, Ch. XX; *Īśvaraśaṃhitā*, Ch. XXI; *Jayākhyasaṃhitā*, Ch. XVI; *Sāttvaśaṃhitā*, Ch. XIX and *Pādmaśaṃhitā-Caryāpāda*, Ch. II. The *Vaikhānasa Āgamas* do not give this privilege to all, and so other Vaiṣṇavas are prohibited from following them but this by no means does belittle the *Vaikhānasa* mode of worship.

Apart from the remarks noted above, the editor deserves the credit for the perseverance shown in the difficult task of editing this *Samhitā* with a fair degree of success. It is hoped that the unpublished *Samhitās* would also be taken up for publication by the Kendriya Sanskrit vidya Peetha.

2. *BHĀRATĪYAṀ VṚTTAM* - (Macdonell's *India's Past* Translated into Sanskrit) by V.S. Venkataraghavacharya - Reader in Sanskrit Education - Kendriya Sanskrit Vidya Peetha, Tirupati, 1968. XXI+405 pp.

India has a glorious past with a stupendous achievements to her credit in almost all fields of human activity. The credit for bringing out this glory must ever belong to the savants of the West who, impelled by curiosity and interest in the study of other nations' achievements, have made a thorough study of the materials for this purpose. Among the works recording the results of their achievements, Macdonell's *India's Past* is highly informative covering all the aspects of the Indians' life.

A work of this kind, which is written in English, is inaccessible to a large section of people who do not have even working knowledge of English, though their proficiency in the classical and regional languages is unquestionable. There is thus the need for rendering these English

works into the Indian languages. The Kendriya Sanskrit Vidya Peetha has realised this need and sponsoring Sanskrit studies, has chosen to start with rendering Macdonell's *India's Past* into Sanskrit for the benefit of the Sanskrit-knowing people spread all through India. This affords an opportunity for the traditional scholars steeped in Sanskrit learning to become aware of the ancient glory of India.

The responsibility that is revealed to achieve this end deserves admiration but is difficult to discharge since the person who bears this has to be conversant with the idioms, diction and the literary manner of both English and Sanskrit. The rendering should present a pleasant and natural reading so as to avoid the reader feeling the need to refer to the original in English for clarification of the obstruse passages in Sanskrit, if there are any. Non-availability of Sanskrit equivalents for the technical terms in English creates a problem which the translator is required to get over before taking up his work.

Sri V.S. Venkataraghavacharya, the autor of the translation under review, has acquitted himself very creditably by reason of his equipment which he has built for himself during the long period of his career as a Sanskrit scholar. The talents required for this purpose he richly possesses. Equivalents have been coined with appropriateness (vide: pp. 99-101). 'Anaisargikāni' (p. 123) for 'more artificial' (p. 95 in the original) are only few among the host of such terms. *Samvṛta* (p. 119) is not however a happy equivalent for obscured (p. 92 in the original). Rightly did the translator avoid rendering into Sanskrit some of the passages in the original work which are themselves English renderings of Sanskrit originals and had reproduced the original Sanskrit passages in the contexts, e.g. pp. 36, 37, 63, 97, 125, etc. Full import is brought out elegantly in several passages, e.g. / 10 on p. 11, para 2 on p. 61. Some passages could rather be taken as original ones than renderings of the originals, e.g. pp. 67-71; 128-132; 136-140. Without literary flavour, the language of the translator presents a direct appeal much as it reflects the historical writing in the original and this points to the flexibility and adaptability of the Sanskrit language to serve a specific purpose at the hands of a talented writer.

The foreword by Sri M. Anantasayanam Ayyangar and the preface of the translator are both in Sanskrit and serve usefully to introduce the work to the readers. As in the works in English, the index serves its purpose.

It is hoped that the translator's services would be utilised for similar renderings of the English originals on Indian culture.

Dr. V. VARADACHARI



K. ACHYUTA POTUVAL

## ईश्वरवादः \*

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं शब्दश्चेति त्रीणि हि वस्तूनां सद्भावस्वरूपाद्यवधारणे प्रमाणानि । अनुमानशब्दौ प्रत्यक्षेणानवगम्येषु वस्तुषु प्रवर्तते । प्रात्यक्षिकज्ञानस्य प्रमात्वं यथा लोकानां चक्षुरादीनामिन्द्रियाणामवैकल्यस्य काचपित्तादिदोषैरदूषितत्वस्य च गीनम्, तथैव आनुमानिकशब्दयोः प्रमात्वमपि अनुमापकानां साद्रूप्यस्य शब्दाना-  
गोक्तत्वस्य चायत्तं भवति । विगुणैर्हेतुभिः अनाप्तोक्तैः शब्दैश्च उत्पद्यमानावनुमिति-  
ब्दौ न खलु प्रमे भवतः । अतश्च हेतूनां गुणवत्तायां शब्दस्याप्तोक्ततायाश्च  
देहस्यावतारे सति ताभ्यामवबोधिते वस्तुनस्तत्वेऽपि नूनं विमर्शकानां विप्रतिपत्ति-  
रिति । इदमेव निदानं दार्शनिकानां तत्र तत्र परोक्षविषयेषु मतभेदप्रादुर्भावे ।  
तैस्मृतिपुराणादिभिः सर्वज्ञत्वसर्वशक्तिमत्त्वाद्यनितरसाधारणप्रभावशालितया बोधि-  
यापि अनुमानैस्साधितस्यापि ईश्वरस्य सद्भावे यत्कतिपये वादिनो विप्रतिपद्यन्ते, तत्र  
मित्तं तस्यार्तान्द्रियत्वमेवेत्येतत् - मन्ये - एतावता व्यक्तं भवतीति ।

प्रत्यक्षातिरिक्तं प्रमाणमैहिकसुखोपभोगादपरं पुरुषार्थं चानभ्युपगच्छन्तश्चावाकाः  
त्र दृश्यते तन्नास्त्वेवेति, यावज्जीवं सुखं जीवेदिति च समुद्धोषयन्तः परलोकस्य  
ईश्वरस्य च सत्तां नाङ्गकुर्वन्ति । क्षणभङ्गवादिनः सर्वशून्यतावादिनश्च बौद्धाद्या  
पि नित्यसत्यस्वरूपस्य भगवत्सत्त्वं नाभ्युपगच्छन्ते, आस्तिकदार्शनिकेषु मीमांसका अपि  
दानामपौरुषेयत्वमाचक्षाणास्तत्प्रणेतारमीश्वरमपलपन्ति । सांख्येष्वपि केचन मीमांस-  
का मत्तमनुमोदन्ते । उक्तेभ्योऽन्ये दार्शनिकाः सर्वेऽपि परमात्मानं स्वीकुर्वन्ति,  
मर्थयन्ति चानेकभिधैरनुमानैः । तर्कमिश्राधनया निर्णीतप्रामाण्येनानुमानेन हि  
वादास्तदस्य परोक्षविषयस्य सत्त्वं तत्त्वञ्चावधारणीयम् ।

\* श्री वेङ्कटेश्वरविश्वविद्यालये संस्कृतविभागस्याभिमुख्ये १९७२ तमे संवत्सरे कृत उपन्यासः ।

ईश्वरास्तित्वसमर्थने निबद्धपरिकरेष्वेतेषु दार्शनिकेषु प्रमाणविद्याप्रवर्तका नैयायिका अग्रण्यो गण्यन्ते । अत एव न्यायदर्शनं सर्वेषां दर्शनान्तराणां मूलस्तम्भं सूरिवरास्संगिरन्ते । नित्यनिर्दोषः सर्वज्ञः परमात्मा, तदादेशरूपाणां वेदानां प्रामाण्यं च यावन्न सुदृढं व्यवस्थाप्यते तावत् भगवत्प्रणिधानप्रकारवेदतात्पर्यादिविवेचनप्रवृत्तानां योगमीमांसादिदर्शनानां हिताहितानुशासकेन कार्यप्रवर्तनाकार्यनिवर्तनाभ्यां स्थितिपालकेन च राज्ञा रहितानां परिचाराणां दयनीया दशैव खलु संपद्येत । तादृशेषु नैयायिकेष्वपि अग्रिमं स्थानमलंकुरुते महामेधार्वा दिगन्तविश्रान्तकीर्तिरुदयनाचार्यः । येन हि परमात्मसमर्थनमात्रार्थं कुसुमाञ्जलिनामकमतिप्रौढमतिसुन्दरं दिसृप्तं च निबन्धनं निरमायि । तत्र विपक्षाणामाक्षेपान् न्यक्षेण प्रतिक्षिप्य निपुणं समर्थितश्च परमात्मनः सद्भावः ।

“स्वर्गापवर्गयोर्मागमामनन्ति मनीषिणः ।

यदुपास्तिमसावत्र परमात्मा निरूप्यते ॥”

इति ग्रन्थारम्भे प्रतिजानन् अनुपदमसावशङ्कते ग्रन्थकारः किम्प्रयोजनोऽयं मे ग्रन्थ, रचनाव्यवसायः ? वस्तुनि संशयास्पदे सत्येव हि तस्य विचारस्तत्त्वाधारणं च प्रसक्तिं प्राप्नोति । ‘नानुपलब्धे न निर्णयते न्यायः प्रवर्तते, किं तु संशयितेऽर्थे’ इति न्यायात् । ‘न चास्ति परमात्मनि संशयः कस्यापि, नित्यनिरवग्रहस्वप्रकाशचिद्रूप इत्यौपनिषदाः, आदिविद्वान् अणिमादिसकलैश्वर्यसंपन्न इति कपिलाः, अविद्यास्मिता-रागद्वेषाभिनिवेशरूपैः क्लेशैः विहितनिषिद्धकर्मभिः जात्यायुर्भोगिरूपैर्विपाकैः पुण्य-पापात्मकैराशयैश्चापामृष्टः वेदादिनिर्माणार्थं स्वेच्छया शरीरं परिगृह्य संप्रदायप्रवर्तकः प्राणिनां पुण्यापुण्यफलप्रदानेनानुग्राहकश्चेति पातञ्जलाः, लोकवेदविरुद्धैः कर्मभि-रनुष्ठीयमानैरपि निर्लेपो जगतः कर्तेति पाशुपताः, अन्वर्थशिवनामधेय इति शैवाः - पुरुषोत्तम इति वैष्णवाः, पितृमह इति पौराणिकाः, यज्ञपुरुष इति याज्ञिकाः, सर्वज्ञ इति सौगताः, धर्माधमेशरीररूपावगणरहित इति दिगम्बराः, उपास्यत्वेन विहित-मन्त्रात्मक इति मीमांसकाः, आलयादिषु ईश्वरत्वेनाभिमन्यमान प्रतिमादिरूपेण वा विलक्षणप्रभावशालि रामकृष्णादिरूपेण वा लोकव्यवहारसिद्ध इति चार्वाकाः, उक्तेषु यानि उपपन्नानि तैस्सर्वैर्युक्त इति नैयायिकाः, किं बहुना, अनक्षरज्ञाः परमपामराः कार्ष्णोऽपि विश्वकर्ममिति यदुशासने, तस्मिन् पण्डितपामरनिर्विशेषमशेषलोकासम्भवे भगवति भवे सन्देह एव कुतः ? तदभावे च किं निरूपयणीयम् ?’ इति ।

एवमाशङ्क्य भागवतोक्तमोऽसौ स्वयमेव समाधत्ते च

‘न्यायचर्चेयमीशय मननव्यदेशभाक् ।

उपास्यैव क्रियते श्रवणानन्तरागता ॥’

इति । श्रुतो हि भगवान् बहुशः श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणादिषु अतस्स मन्तव्यो भवति । श्रवणानन्तरं मननस्य विहितत्वात्, युक्तिभिरनुचिन्तनं हि मननं नाम । तदेतन्मननमेवोपासनात्मकं तार्थावबोधस्य दाढर्यापादनाय ग्रन्थरचनाव्याजेन मया क्रियत इत्यर्थः ।

एवं ग्रन्थनिर्मितेः सार्थकतां प्रतिपाद्य परमात्मनः समर्थनार्थमुपक्रान्तं ग्रन्थकृता । तत्र परपक्षप्रतिक्षेपपूर्वकं स्वपक्षस्थापनाय उपन्यस्तेष्वनेकेषु हेतुषु परलोकसाधनबोधक-वेदोपदेष्टृत्वं क्षित्यादिप्रपञ्चकर्तृत्वमित्येतयोरुभयोरधिगमिव प्रतीयते नैर्भर्यमाचार्याणाम् । यतस्तयोः परिकरपौष्कल्यसंपादने दृश्यते तेषां निरतिशयोऽभिनिवेशः । तयोराद्यस्य परलोकस्य साधनं यत् तद्बोधको यो वेदः तदुपदेष्टृत्वस्य सिसाधयिषितसाधने सामर्थ्यं तदैव पर्याप्तं भवति, यदा परलोकोऽस्तीति, स च साधनाधीन इति, तच्च साधनमदृष्टमेवेति तस्य बोधको वेद इति, वेदः पौरुषेय इति, स च पुरुषः समस्तपरोक्षवस्तुदर्शी सर्वलोकोत्तरः कश्चिदेव भवितुमर्हतीति च साध्यते साधु । तदेतत्सर्वमनुक्रमेण प्रसाधितं चात्र ।

इह सर्वैरस्माभिरनुभूयते हि नित्यदौर्गत्य-शाश्वतैश्वर्य-रोगारोग्य काणकुब्ज-बधिरमूकभावादिभिरुच्चावचसुखदुःखभोगादिभिश्च वाचामगोचरं वैचित्र्यं जगति किं निबन्धनमिदं भवेत् ? न खलु कारणानपेक्षमेवेत्युपपद्यते, तथा सति कार्यकारणभाव एव विलुप्येत ? विलोपे च सर्वाण्यपि कार्याणि कारणनिरपेक्षत्वाच्चित्ताकाशादिवत् सदापि स्युः । शशयुङ्गादिवत् कदापि वा न स्युः । न तु कादाचित्कानि स्युः तदवश्यं कार्यजातस्य कादाचित्कतानियामकं कारणमुररीकरणीयम् । तदनुरोधेन प्रस्तुतवैचित्र्यस्यापि निर्वाहकं निमित्तं किञ्चिदन्वेषणीयम् । तत्तु दृष्टकारण-कलापमालेण समाश्रयस्यालाभाददृष्टरूपमेष्टव्यम् । एवं सति तस्य कारणस्यापि कादाचित्कत्वात् कारणान्तरं, तथा तस्यापीत्येवमनवस्था स्यादिति चेदिष्यत एवैषा । परं तु न दुष्यते ततः किञ्चित् । संसारयानादितया तस्यार्वाजांकुरानवस्था समशीलत्वात् । तच्चादृष्टं नैकमेव भवितुमर्हति । तथैवे जगद्वैचित्र्यनिर्वाहकत्वायोगात् । कारणस्य वैचित्र्यं हि कार्यगतं तन्निर्वाहुं क्षमते । अतः प्रत्यात्मनियतानां सुखदुःखभोगादीनां नियामकतया कल्प्यमानमदृष्टं तत्तदात्मगतं पृथक्पृथगेवेत्यास्थेयम् । तथाविधानां तेषां मध्ये एतत्फलजनकमदृष्टमेतदित्येवं प्रातिस्विकधर्मरुस्कारेण प्रत्येकादगतौ अलौकिकार्थ-प्रतिपादको वेद एव एवोपायः । भवतु वेदेन विहितानां यज्ञादीनां निषिद्धानां हिंसादीनां च कर्मणामेव जीवलोकभोगादिवैविध्यनियामकता कृतमदृष्टेनेति तु न युक्तं

पर्यनुयोक्तुम् । तेषामाशुविनाशशीलानां कर्मणां कालान्तरभाविफलपर्यन्तावस्थायि-  
ताविरहेण व्यापारनिरपेक्षमुक्तनियामकताया दुरूपपादत्वात् । यदि पूर्वानुभवानामौत्तर-  
कालिकस्मृत्युत्पादकतानिर्वाहाय भावनाख्यसंस्कारस्येव तेषां कर्मणामप्यनुमन्यत एव  
कल्पना कस्यचिद्व्यापारस्य, तर्हि समर्थितो भवत्यस्मदीयः पक्ष एव । तमेव हि  
व्यापारमदृष्टमाचक्ष्महे । तच्च प्रत्येतव्यं वेदेनैव । स वेदश्च विशिष्टसन्निवेशपरि-  
कर्मितशब्दसंवातात्मा रामायणभारतादिवत् पौरुषेयो भवन् निखिलातीन्द्रियार्थसार्थ-  
साक्षात्कर्तारं प्रणेतारमात्मनः प्रत्याययति । स एव सर्ववेत्ता वेदवक्ता पुरुषधौरेयः  
ब्रह्मपरमात्मादिपर्यायान्तरैरपि व्यपदिश्यमानः परमेश्वर इत्यस्मदीयं दर्शनम् । एवं  
कार्यजातस्य कृतृसापेक्षता दृश्यते नियतेति क्षित्यादेरस्मदादिकृतृकत्वं संभावनाया  
अप्ययोग्यस्य प्रपञ्चस्य कर्तृतयापि निराबाधा तस्य सिद्धिः ।

यत्र दृश्यते तत्रास्त्येवेति स्वबुद्धिमात्रपरिकल्पितं नियममदृष्ट्य अप्रत्यक्षमीश्वर-  
मपलपतः चार्वाकस्य वादमत्यन्तबालिशं विदन्नाचार्यः तं बालवदेव नर्मभिरुपहरन्  
दुरभिनिवेशादस्मान्निवर्तयति । एवमाचार्यः चार्वाकं पृच्छति — अयि भोः सरलमते !  
गृहाद् बहिर्गतो भवान् न खलु पश्यति गृहे विद्यमानान् पुत्रकलत्रादीन् स्वजनान्,  
तदानीं ते सन्ति वा न वा ? न सन्तीत्येव हि अप्रत्यक्षस्यासत्तां वदता भवता  
वक्तव्यम् एवं च स्वजनव्यापत्तिः स्यात्कुलस्तदा कुतो न व्याक्रोशसि मूर्छितो न वीथ्यां  
निपतसि वा ? किमिति पुनर्निवर्तते च स्वाभिष्टजनहीनमायतनं कुश्च गृहावस्थायि-  
नस्तेऽपि भवदपायविवशाः सोरस्ताडं नाक्रन्दन्ति ? तदानीमपि स्मृतिरस्तीति चेत्,  
मरणानन्तरमपि सास्तीति कुतो विलप्यते ? किं चानुमानादीनामप्रमाणतां ब्रुवाणोऽपि  
प्रत्यक्षस्य प्रमाणत्वमङ्गीकुरुष्वे खलु, तदपि कथम् ? अतीन्द्रियतैजसमरीच्यादिरूपाणां  
नयनादीनामिन्द्रियाणामदृश्यत्वात् न खलु त्वन्मते सत्ताशयते स्वीकर्तुम् । तथा च  
कथमसतस्तस्य धर्मो भवेत् प्रमाणत्वम् ? सति हि धर्मिणि तस्मिन्नवस्थितिः स्याद्धर्मस्य ।  
कृष्णतारादीनामेव नयनादिरूपत्वात् तेषां दृश्यतया सत्त्वाच्च उपपद्यत एव प्रमाणतेति  
चेत्, सा तारका घटादिसाक्षात्कारात् पूर्वं किमवेक्ष्यते ? अनवेक्षणे कथं प्रत्यक्षात्  
पूर्वं तस्यास्सत्त्वम् ? कार्यात्प्रागसत्याश्च कथं तत्करित्वम् ? स्वस्य स्वकनीनिका-  
साक्षात्कारश्च दर्पणाद्याभिमुख्यकाल एव जायत इति तदन्यकालेषु सर्वेषामन्धतैव  
किमभिमता भवतः ? इति ।

ईदृशैरुपहासैश्चार्वाकं मूकं कृत्वा क्षणभङ्गवादावष्टम्भेन मत्सरायाभ्युद्यता अपि  
मापितवाग्विष्टम्भाः पुनरुत्सारिताः । यत् सत् तत् क्षणिकमिति सन्मात्रस्य क्षण-

भङ्गुरतास्वभावे स्वीक्रियमाणे कर्तुरभोक्तृत्वं भोक्तुरकर्तृत्वं चापततीति कृतहाना-  
कृताभ्यागमौ प्रसज्येयाताम् । आपद्येत चानुपपत्तिरनुभूतिस्मृत्योः । अनुभविता  
स्मर्ता च पूर्वोत्तरकालवर्तिनावेतन्मते मिथो भिद्येते । तदेतत् कथं वा सङ्गच्छेत ?  
न खल्वेकेनानुभूतमन्यः स्मरति । पूर्वपूर्वक्षणावस्थायिनां सतामुत्तरोत्तरकारणतायाः,  
कारणवर्तिनां संस्कारादीनां मृगमदवासनाया वसन इव कार्ये संक्रान्तेश्च कल्पनाच्चेय-  
मनुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, मात्रानुभूतं गर्भस्थेन शिशुनापि स्मर्येत । अतो नायं पक्षोऽपि  
सनातनपरमात्मसाधने बाधकतां भजते ।

वेदानामपौरुषेयत्वमाचक्षाणाः कर्ममीमांसकाः तत्कर्तृत्वेनेश्वरसाधने यत् प्रत्य-  
वतिष्ठन्ते, तत् तेषां नित्यत्वसिद्धावेव घटेत् । वस्तुतो वर्णा एव न नित्याः । तत्  
कथं तद्वटितानि पदानि, पदसमूहरूपाणि वाक्यानि, तत्संघातात्मा वेदो वा नित्यतां  
प्रपद्येरन् ? प्रतिष्ठापितं च महता प्रपञ्चेनात्र ग्रन्थे, वर्णानामनित्यत्वम्, ग्रन्थान्तरेषु च  
न्ययन्यानुयायिप्रणीतेषु ।

एवं कार्याणां सकर्तृकतानैयत्ये विप्रतिपत्तिं ईश्वरस्य क्षित्यादिकर्तृत्वे सशरीरत्वा-  
पत्तिञ्चोद्भाव्य क्षित्यादिपक्षकानुमानं दूषयितुकामानां चार्वाकादीनां वादानपि अनितर-  
साधारणधिषणा बलशालिनः चतुरोदारगभीरवाग्वैखरीधुरीणश्चाचार्याः यथावसरं सुदूरं  
निरस्यन्ति स्म ।

इदमन्यदप्यत्र विद्यते वक्तव्यम्, यदुक्ताभ्यां जगत्कारणत्ववेदप्रणेतृत्वाभ्यां हेतुभ्या-  
मीश्वरसाधनमनुमन्यते वैयासिकेन शास्त्रेणापीति, तत्र जगत्कारणत्वेन तत्साधनमनुमतं  
'जन्माद्यस्य यत्' इति सूत्रेण, अस्य - नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृयुक्तस्य  
प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जगतः, जन्मादि-  
जन्मस्थिति - भङ्गाः, यतः - यस्मात् कारणात् भवति तत् ब्रह्मेति हि तस्यार्थः ।  
एवं 'शास्त्रयोनित्वत्' इत्यनन्तरसूत्रं वेदप्रणेतृत्वेन तत्साधनमनुमोदते । शास्त्रस्य  
अनेकविधास्थानोपबृंहितस्य प्रदीपवत्सर्वार्थप्रकाशकस्य महत् ऋग्वेदादिरूपस्य शास्त्रस्य,  
येनित्वात् कारणत्वात् । न हीदृशस्य शास्त्रस्य सर्वज्ञादन्यतः सम्भवोऽस्तीति तदर्थः ।

सर्वकलाशालासु ईदृशानां प्रम.पणानां समयः परिमित एव प्रायशो दृष्ट इत्यतः  
विस्तारनौचित्यं मन्यमानोऽहमीश्वरसद्भावस्मर्थनार्थमाचार्यैराहतायाः सरणेरिदृक्तावबोधनाय  
तदोद्यग्रन्थादितस्ततः कांश्चनांशान् केवलमादायात्र प्रास्तौषमित्यप्यन्ते निवेदयन्  
विरमामि ॥



Dr. V. KRISHNASWAMI IYANGAR

## कथं व्युत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या ?

वैयाकरणेषु श्रेष्ठो भगवान् पाणिनिः संस्कृतभाषायाः स्वरूपं सम्यग् विविच्य परिनिष्ठितं व्याकरणं रचयामासेति सर्वे भाषाविदः संप्रतियन्ति । किंतु, पाणिनिः कुत्रापि व्याकरणनिर्माणे स्वयमनुसृतं सिद्धान्तं न प्रतिपादयति । कंचित् सिद्धान्त-मनुरुध्यैवायं व्याकरणं प्राणैषीत् ; परंतु सिद्धान्तचर्चामप्रस्तुतां मत्वा केवलं नियमानेव ग्रन्थरूपेण निबबन्ध । तथापि एकस्मिन् प्रसङ्गे पाणिनिरपि स्वसंमतं सिद्धान्तं कंचिद-नतिविस्तरेण निरूपयति ।

पूर्वाचार्याणां मतं च निराकरोति । एतानि सिद्धान्तप्रतिपादनेदम्पराणि पञ्चसूत्राणि प्रथमाध्यायस्य द्वितीये पादे उपलभ्यन्ते । तत्र प्राधान्येनेदं विचार्यते — शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिः कमाधारमुपजीव्य प्रदर्शनीयेति । कथं व्युत्पत्तिर्वक्तव्या ? किं सर्वे शब्दा व्युत्पादनीयाः ? शब्देन प्रतिपाद्यमानस्यार्थस्य, कल्प्यमानाया व्युत्पत्तेश्च कः संबन्धः ? इदृशा विषयाः एषु सूत्रेषु पाणिनिना विमृश्यन्ते । प्रासंगिकं किंचिदन्यदप्युच्यते । तानि सूत्राणि नीचैरुदाहरामः —

- |  |         |
|--|---------|
| १. तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्                 | 1.2.53. |
| २. लुब्धोगाप्रख्यानात्                         | 1.2.54. |
| ३. योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात्           | 1.2.55. |
| ४. प्रधानप्रत्ययार्थवचनमर्थस्यान्यप्रमाणत्वात् | 1.2.56. |
| ५. कालोपसर्जने च तुल्यम्                       | 1.2.57. |

एषु अन्तिमे द्वे सूत्रे प्रथमं विचारयामः । तत्र कौमुदी — “प्रत्ययार्थः प्रधानमित्येवं रूपं वचनमप्यशिष्यम् । कुतः ? अर्थस्य लोकत एव सिद्धेः ।

‘अतीताया रालेः पश्चाद्धेन, आगामिन्याः पूर्वाद्धेन च सहितो दिवसोऽद्यतनः । विशेषणमुपसर्जनम्’ इत्यादि पूर्वाचार्यैः परिभाषितम् । तत्राप्याशिष्यत्वं समानम् । लोकप्रसिद्धेः” [पृ. 248] इति व्याचष्टे । शब्दबोधप्रक्रियायां प्रकृत्यर्थः प्रत्ययार्थेऽन्वेति ; तत्र प्रकृत्यर्थो विशेषणं, प्रत्ययार्थश्च विशेष्यत्वात् प्रधानमिति पूर्वाचार्यैरुक्तोऽयमर्थः । पाणिनिरिममर्थं न प्रत्याचष्टे । प्रत्ययार्थमाधान्यस्य तेनाप्यभ्युपगमात् । किं त्वेतत् पृथक् सूत्रेण न वक्तव्यम् ; अस्यार्थस्य लोकसिद्धत्वात्, शास्त्रेण विधानस्यानपेक्षणात् । न हि व्याकरणे, अस्य शब्दस्यायमर्थ इति निर्देशः क्रियते । अर्थज्ञानस्य लोकव्यवहारसाध्यत्वात् । एवमद्यतनः कालोऽयम्, अयं चानद्यतन इति परिभाषापि न कर्तव्या ; लोकप्रसिद्धत्वादेव । तस्मादत्राप्यर्थे पाणिनेर्न विवादः, किंतु परिभाषार्थं वचनारम्भो मा भूदित्येतावत्येव तस्य तात्पर्यमिति स्पष्टम् । अनद्यतने लङ्, परोक्षे लिट् इत्यादौ सूत्रकारः, तेन शब्देन व्यवहरति ; किंतु प्रयोगप्रसिद्धत्वादस्यार्थस्य तन्निर्णयार्थं वचनं नापेक्षितमिति मन्यते । उपसर्जन-शब्दो विशेषणार्थकः पाणिनीये व्याकरणे प्रयुज्यते । ‘संज्ञोपसर्जनीभूतास्तु न सर्वा-दयः, गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्य’ इत्यादि द्रष्टव्यम् । परंतु विशेषणमुपसर्जनसंज्ञं भवतीति न वक्तव्यम् । तस्यार्थस्य लोकसिद्धत्वात् । एवमनयोः सूत्रयोः प्राचीनाचार्यमतं खण्डयन्नपि पाणिनिस्तदुक्तमर्थं स्वीकरोति, केवलं वचनारम्भमेव निराकरोतीति प्रेक्षावतामपरोक्षमेतत् ।

अनयोः सूत्रयोर्विषये वार्तिककारो भाष्यकारो वा न किञ्चिदाह । तेन सूत्रकारस्योक्तिं तावुभावपि निर्विवादं स्वीकुरुत इति निश्चीयते । सति तु मतभेदे तौ किञ्चिदवक्ष्यताम् । अवचनान्तभेदो नास्तीति स्पष्टमवगम्यते ।

तदशिष्यमित्यादेरयमर्थः — ‘युक्तवद्वचनं न कर्तव्यं, संज्ञानां प्रमाणत्वात्’ इति । ‘लुपि युक्तवद् व्यक्तिवचने’ [1.2.51] इति युक्तवद्भाव उक्तः । अस्मिन् सूत्रे व्यक्तिरिति लिङ्गमुच्यते । लुपि सति प्रकृतिवत् लिङ्गवचने स्यातामिति सूत्रार्थः । युक्तशब्दः प्रकृतिपरः, तस्या एव प्रत्यययुक्तत्वात् । ‘लुप्’ इति लोपस्येव विशिष्टा संज्ञा ‘प्रत्ययस्य लुक्श्लुलुपः’ इति परिभाषणात् । लोपस्य संज्ञाभेदात् फले भेदो भवति । श्लोकृते धातोर्द्वित्वं भवति — ‘जुहोत्यादिभ्यः श्लुः’ इति श्लोकृते जुहोति बिभेतीत्यादौ द्वित्वं द्रष्टव्यम् । लुपि तु कृते प्रत्ययोत्पत्तेः पूर्वं प्रवृत्तेर्यत् लिङ्गं यच्च वचनं तदेव प्रत्ययान्तस्य पि प्राप्तिर्दिक्स्येत्यनेन सूत्रेण विधीयते । एष एव युक्त-वद्भावः । लुका लुप्ते तु ‘न लुमताङ्गस्य’ इति निषेधात् प्रत्ययलक्षणमङ्गकार्यं न



भवति । पदत्वादि तु भवत्येव । एषा स्थितिः पाणिनीये व्याकरणे दृश्यते । तमिमं युक्तवद्भावं पाणिनिः प्रत्याचष्टे ।

चतुर्थाध्यायस्य द्वितीये पादे तद्धितप्रत्ययाः केचन केषुचिदर्थविशेषेषु विधीयन्ते । तत्तेमानि चत्वारि सूत्राणि चतुरोऽर्थान् विशिष्य निर्दिशन्ति ।

- |                                   |         |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| १. तदस्मिन्नस्तीति देशे तन्नाम्नि | 4 2 67. |
| २. तेन निर्वृत्तम्                | 4.2 68. |
| ३. तस्य निवासः                    | 4.2.69. |
| ४. अदूरभवश्च                      | 4.2.70. |

क्रमेणैषामुदाहरणानि प्रदर्शयामः । उदुम्बराः सन्त्यस्मिन् देशे औदुम्बरः । अत्र तदस्यास्त्यस्मिन्निति मतुप् प्राप्तः । मतुपोऽयमपवादः । तन्नाम्नीति पदं तत्त्व-बोधिनी एवं व्याचष्टे—‘तत् प्रत्ययान्तं नाम यस्येति बहुव्रीहिः’ इति । एष प्रथमोऽर्थः । द्वितीयमुदाहरणं कुशाम्बेन निर्वृत्ता कौशाम्बी नगरीति । शिबीनां निगासो देशः शैव इति तृतीयमुदाहरणम् । विदिशाया अदूरभवं नगरं वैदिशमिति तु तुरीयम् । एते चत्वारोऽर्थाः सूत्रकारेण क्रमेणोक्ताः । एतानि किं पृथक् चत्वारि सूत्राणि, आहोस्वि-देकमेव सूत्रमिति पृष्ट्वा, भाष्यकारः ‘यथेच्छसि तथास्तु’ इति पक्षद्वयेऽपि फले न कोऽपि विशेष इति समाधत्ते । ‘अदूरभवश्चेत्यत्र चकारेण प्रागुक्तास्त्रयोऽर्थाः समुच्चीयन्ते; तेन वक्ष्यमाणप्रत्ययानां चातुरर्थिकत्वं सिध्यति’ इति कौमुद्यां [पृ. 247] स्पष्टम् । एते प्रत्ययाश्चतुर्वर्थेषु विहतत्वात् चातुरर्थिका उच्यन्ते ।

पञ्चालानां निवासो जनपद इत्यर्थे, तस्य निवास इति सूत्रेण प्रत्ययः प्राप्नोति । तस्य, ‘जनपदे लुप्’ [4.2.81] इति सूत्रेण पाणिनिर्लोपं विधत्ते । लुपा लुप्ते युक्तवद्भावं चाह । तेन पञ्चालानां निवास इति षष्ठ्यन्ताद्बहुवचनान्ताच्च पदात् प्रत्यये प्रत्ययान्तस्य प्रातिपदिकत्वात्तदवयवस्य सुपो लुकि, प्रत्ययस्य लुपा लुप्तत्वात् युक्तवद्भावेन लिङ्ग-वचनयोर्व्यवस्थेति केचित् । अत्रे तु प्रातिपदिकादेव तद्धितोत्पत्तिमिच्छन्ति, ङष्प्रातिपदिकादित्यधिकारात् । तेषां मते सुपो लुक् नास्तीत्येतावान् विशेषः । पञ्चालाः, कुरवः, अङ्गाः, वङ्गाः इत्यादीन्युदाहरणानि । एषु पुंस्त्वं बहुत्वं च युक्तवद्भावादेव ।

इमं युक्तवद्भावं सूत्रकारः प्रत्याचष्टे । प्रत्याख्याने च हेतुमाह — संज्ञा-प्रमाणत्वादिति । पञ्चाला इत्यादयो हि देशविशेषाणां संज्ञाः । ता एता संज्ञाः

पुंस्त्वे बहुत्वे चैव वर्तन्ते, शब्दस्वाभाव्यात् । आपः, दाराः इत्यादौ यथा वचनारम्भ-  
मन्तरेणापि लिङ्गवचनयो र्यवस्था लोकादेव सिध्यति तथात्रापीति बोध्यम् । तस्माद्युक्त-  
वद्वावार्थं वचनं नारम्भणीयमिति भावः ।

संस्कृतभाषायां लिङ्गव्यवस्था शब्दस्वरूपमाश्रित्य प्रवर्तते, नत्वर्थम् । समानार्थका  
अपि भिन्नलिङ्गाः शब्दा दृश्यन्ते । पत्नी, भार्या, जाया इत्यादयः शब्दाः स्त्रियां वर्तन्ते;  
दारा इति तु पुंसि ; कलत्रमिति क्लीबे । एवं दृष्टत्, पाषाणः, शिला इत्येवमादीनि  
बहूनि उदाहरणानि उपलभ्यन्ते । केचिच्छब्दा नियतलिङ्गा उच्यन्ते ; तेषां  
समभिव्यक्तसंगन्धिशब्दापेक्षो लिङ्गभेदो न भवति । यथा वेदाः प्रमाणं,  
प्रत्ययार्थः प्रधानमित्यादि । केचिद् द्विलिङ्गाः शब्दाः । केचित्तु त्रिलिङ्गाः ।  
एवं लिङ्गव्यवस्थाया जटिलत्वात्, कस्य शब्दस्य किं लिङ्गमिति निश्चित्य ज्ञात् न  
शक्यते, प्रयोगानन्तरेण । प्रयोग एवात्र प्रमाणम् । क्वचित्तु परवल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्व-  
तत्पुरुषयोः ; अकारोत्तरपदो द्विगुः स्त्रियामिष्ट इति व्यवस्था विधीयते । परं तु भाषायां  
वर्तमानाः सर्वे शब्दा एवं नियमैर्व्यवस्थापयितुं न शक्यन्ते । अत एव भाष्यकारः  
'लिङ्गमश्लेष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वात् लिङ्गस्य' इति स्वमतं सिद्धान्तयति । तस्मात्, मा भूत्  
लिङ्गार्थो युक्तवद्भावः । वचनार्थस्तु कथं प्रत्याख्यायते ? आपो दारा इत्यादौ बहुत्वस्य  
वचनं विनापि सिद्धिरिति नेदं वक्तुं युक्तम् । कुत्र बहुत्वं स्वाभाविकं, कुत्र च नेति  
विशिष्य वक्तव्यत्वात् । अन्यथा, सर्वेषां शब्दानां लोकात् एव सिद्धेः शास्त्रारम्भ  
एवानर्थकः स्यात् । शिष्टप्रयोगादेव साधुत्वासाधुत्वयोर्व्यवस्था संभवात् । यदि च  
लोकसिद्धानामपि शब्दानां शास्त्रेणान्वाख्यानं लघ्वर्थमिष्यते तर्हि वचननियमस्यापि  
वक्तव्यत्वात् प्रत्याख्यानं नोपपद्यते । किं च । लिङ्गविचारेऽपि यत्र उत्सर्गपवाद-  
रूपेण काचिद् व्यवस्था संभवति, तत्र सा वक्तव्यैव । अत एव पाणिनिः,  
'स्त्रियां क्तिन्', 'नपुंसके भावे क्तः' इत्यादिना तत्रतत्र लिङ्गमप्यनुशास्ति । न चेदं सर्वं  
व्यर्थमिति वक्तुं युक्तम् । सति संभवे नियमानामुपनिबन्धस्य शास्त्रकारेणावश्य-  
कर्तव्यत्वात् । यत्र तु लुनोपायेनान्वाख्यानं न संभवति, तत्र अगतिकगत्या प्रयोग  
एवाश्रीयते । 'पृषेदरादीनि यथोपदिष्टम्' इति यथा । तस्मादत्र लिङ्गसंख्यानियमार्थं  
वचनमपेक्षणीयमेवेति प्रतिभाति । लुप एवानङ्गीकारे तु लिङ्गसंख्ययोर्नियमकं  
किञ्चित्वास्तीति हेतोः प्रयोगनामाप्यमेवाश्रयणीयम् । अङ्गीकृते तु लुपि तमाश्रित्य  
प्रवर्तमानोऽयं लिङ्गसंज्ञानियमो न प्रत्याख्येयः, प्रत्युत स्वीकर्तव्य एवेति संप्रतिपद्यामहे ।  
पाणिनिस्तु लुपमपि नेच्छति ।

तदाह — 'लुब्धोगाप्रख्यानात्' इति । योगो नाम अदयवाथः । अदयवार्थस्य

ऐक्ष्वाकः' इति कौमुदी (पृ. 237) । तत्त्वबोधिनी च 'जनपदवाची सन् यः क्षत्रिय-वाचीत्यर्थः । यद्यपि पञ्चालादयो जनपदे बहुवचनान्ताः, क्षत्रिये त्वेकवचनान्ताः, तथापि प्रातिपदिकस्योभयवाचिकत्वं अक्षतमेवेति बोध्यम्' इति केषांचिच्छब्दानां जनपदक्षत्रियोभयवाचकत्वं प्रतिपादयति । यदि पञ्चालशब्दः स्वयं क्षत्रियवाचकः, ततश्च चातुरर्थिकप्रत्ययान्तत्वाद् देशवाचक इत्याश्रीयते तर्हि तस्य कथं समानशब्दत्वं संभवति ?

अत्र सूत्रे वार्तिककारः 'क्षत्रियादेकराजात्संवप्रतिषेधार्थम्' इत्याह । भाष्य-कारश्चैतदेवं व्याचष्टे — 'क्षत्रियादेकराजादिति वक्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् ? सध-प्रतिषेधार्थम् । संवाग्मा भूत् — पञ्चालानामपत्यं, विदेहानामपत्यमिति । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् ? न वक्तव्यम् । न ह्यन्तरेण बहुषु लुक् पञ्चाला इत्येतद् भवति । यस्तस्मादुत्पद्यते युवप्रत्ययः स स्यात् । युवप्रत्ययश्चेत्तस्य लुक्, तस्मिन्श्चालुग् भविष्यति' [4.1.168, पृ. 171-172] इति । 'यथैव एकः क्षत्रियः पञ्चालस्तथैव बहवः क्षत्रियाः पञ्चालाः' इति प्रत्ययप्रसङ्गे वचनमिदम्' इति कैयटः । अस्याभिप्रायं नागेशः स्पष्ट-यति — "ननु पञ्चालशब्दादपि, बहुषु 'यज्ञोश्च' इति 'तद्राजस्य' इति वा लुकि पञ्चाला इति भवति । ततोऽपत्यविवक्षायां 'एको गोत्रे' इति नियमात् न गोत्रे प्रत्ययप्राप्तिः, यूनि तु अजादि प्राग्दीव्यतीयविषये गोत्रप्रत्ययस्य अलुकि पाञ्चाल-शब्दे संपन्ने जनपदसमानशब्दत्वाभावात् नैव प्राप्तिः, अत आह—यथैवेति । न बहुषु पञ्चालशब्दो यौगिकः, किं त्वेकस्मिन्नैव रूढ एवेति भावः । उत्तरस्य तु एक-स्मिन्नेव रूढिः, बहुषु मानाभावादिति भावः' इति । 'ते तद्राजाः' इति एते अजादयः प्रत्ययास्तद्राजसंज्ञां लभन्ते । 'तद्राजस्य बहुषु तेनैवास्त्रिया' मिति बहुत्वे तेषां लुक् च विधीयते । तथा च कौमुदी — 'बहुष्वर्थेषु तद्राजस्य लुक् स्यात्तदर्थकृते बहुत्वे, न तु स्त्रियाम् । इक्ष्वाकवः । पञ्चालाः इत्यादि । कथं तर्हि कौरव्याः पशव इति ? तस्यामेव रघोः पाण्डया इति च ? कौरव्ये पाण्डये च साधव इति समाधेयम् । रघूनामन्वयं वक्ष्ये, निरुध्यमाना यदुभिः कथं चि'दिति तु रघुयदु-शब्दयोस्तदपत्ये लक्षणया' (पृ. 238) इति । एवं च बहुत्वे 'पञ्चालाः' इति तद्राजस्य लुकि रूपं निष्पद्यते । तस्मादयं यौगिकः । केचित्तु पञ्चाल इति यथा एकवचनान्तः क्षत्रियवाची तथा बहुवचनान्तोऽपि रूढ एवेति वदन्ति । एकवचनान्त एव रूढः । न तु बहुवचनान्तोऽपीति नागेशो मतान्तरं दर्शयति ।

कैयटः भाष्यवार्तिकयोराशयमसंदिग्धं वर्णयति — 'यद्येवं पाञ्चाल इति सर्वथा भवतिव्यमिति किं वार्तिकारम्भेण ? तत्र वार्तिककारस्याभिप्रायमाहुः — अस्ति

वार्तिकारम्भे बहुवचनान्तादेव प्रत्ययः स्यात्, नत्वेकवचनान्तात् । जनपदे हि बहुवचनान्तः पञ्चालशब्दः वर्तते इति तस्यैव जनपदसमानशब्दत्वं क्षत्रियवृत्तिर्यं च । भाष्यकारस्तु मन्यते — प्रातिपदिकस्य जनपदसमानशब्दत्वं ग्राह्यं न सुवन्तस्येति एकवचनान्तात्प्रत्ययः केन वार्यते ? [4.1.168, पृ. 172] इति । एवं च पञ्चाला-  
नामपर्यं पाञ्चाल इति मा भूदित्येवमर्थं वार्तिकमिति वाच्यम् । तच्च दुर्निवारमिष्टं चेति व्यावर्तयितुमशक्यमित्याशयेन प्रत्याख्यातं वार्तिकमिति भावः' इति । नागेशोऽ  
द्योते इदमेव प्रपञ्चयति । एतेन पञ्चालादयः शब्दा रूढ्या जनपदं क्षत्रियं च बोधयन्तीति स्पष्टम् ।

अस्मिन्नेवसूत्रे 'क्षत्रियसमानशब्दाज्जनपदात् तस्य राजन्यपत्यवत्' इति वार्तिक-  
कारः राजार्थकं प्रत्ययं शास्ति । पञ्चालानां राजा पाञ्चाल इति भाष्यकारश्च उदाहरति ।  
'तद्राजमाचक्षाणस्तद्राज इत्यन्वर्थसंज्ञा' इति कौमुदी । यद्यप्यस्याः संज्ञायाः अन्वर्थत्वं  
भाष्यकारेण नोक्तं, तथापि महासंज्ञाया अस्या उपपद्यमानमन्वर्थत्वं बाधकाभावात्  
स्वीक्रियते । एतेन क्षत्रियसंबन्धं निमित्तमाश्रित्य देशस्य नाम व्युत्पाद्यते । देश-  
संबन्धं निमित्तमाश्रित्य क्षत्रियस्य राज्ञो नाम व्युत्पाद्यते इति सूत्र वार्तिकयोरितरेतर-  
संबन्धः स्पष्टतया प्रतीयते ।

ऐतिहासिकास्तावदेवं वदेयुः — 'पुरा क्षत्रियसंबन्धादेव देशानां पञ्चालादि  
संज्ञा बभूवुः । गच्छता कालेन क्षत्रियसंबन्धं विनापि रूढिमात्रेण — भूतपूर्वगत्या  
तासां संज्ञानां व्यवहारो जज्ञे । अत एवेदं समानशब्दत्वं संगच्छते' इति ।  
शब्दानामर्थेऽपि कालान्तरे परिवर्तनं भवतीति भाषाविदो जानन्ति । यास्केन निरुक्ते  
न शब्दस्य वेदे औपम्यार्थकत्वं दर्शितम् । लोके त्वेष प्रतिषेधार्थक एव प्रयुज्यते ।  
असुरशब्दः पूर्वं देवरात्रौ भूत्वा पश्चात्तद्विरोध्यर्थको बभूवेति शब्दतत्त्वज्ञा आहुः ।  
निरूढा लक्षणा कुशलादि शब्देषु शास्त्रकारैरुक्ता अस्यैव अर्थपरिवर्तनस्य प्रमाणम् ।  
तस्मात् पूर्वं क्षत्रियसंबन्धं हेतुमाश्रित्यप्रवृत्ताः पञ्चालादयः - संज्ञाः कालान्तरे योगार्थं  
त्यक्त्वा रूढिमात्रेण जनपदानभिधेयतीति युक्तमेतत्प्रतिभाति । किन्तु यः शब्दाना-  
मुत्पत्तिरूपान्तरं विचारं विकासमर्थान्तरं च ऐतिहासिको भूत्वा परीक्षते तेनेदं काम-  
मुच्यताम् । यस्तु वैयाकरणः समानकालिको भाषां व्याकरोति, स तावदवयवार्थ-  
प्रतीतिमनुपलभमानो व्युत्पत्तिं नैव स्वीकुर्यात् । सति त्ववयवार्थं व्युत्पत्तिमवश्यं ब्रूयात् ।  
इमं सिद्धान्तमनुसरन् पाणिनिः, योगार्थस्य अत्रतीतेः पञ्चालादीनां शब्दानां रूढत्व-  
मिच्छन् लुपं निराकरोति ।

भाष्ये तु 'सन्ति यदृच्छाशब्दाः, चतुष्टयीशब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः' इति 'त्रयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः, न सन्ति यदृच्छाशब्दाः' इति च उभावपि पक्षौ 'ऋलुक्' सूत्रवार्तिक्याख्याने प्रदर्शितौ । पक्षान्तरैरपि परिहारा भवन्तीति प्रौढवदमाश्रित्य समर्थितं पश्यामः । किन्तु भाषान्तरेष्विव संस्कृतभाषायामपि यदृच्छाशब्दा उपलभ्यमानाः केनापि वारयितुमपलपितुं वा न शक्यन्ते । बह्वश्च शब्दाः संस्कृतभाषायां भाषान्तरेभ्यः समागता इति च भाषातत्त्वज्ञाः सप्रमाणं स्थापयन्ति । द्राविडादिभाषापरिवारेभ्यः संस्कृतभाषायामागताः शब्दाः शताधिकाः सन्तीति विमर्शका विद्वांसः समन्यन्ते । एतेषां भाषान्तरशब्दानां संस्कृतभाषायां परिगृहीतानां साधुत्वं तादृक् वक्तव्यमेव । तेषां यथाकथंचिद् व्युत्पत्तिं प्रदर्श्य संस्कृतव्याकरणानुसारित्वं स्थापनीयमिति केचिदमन्यन्त ते उणादिप्रत्ययान् कल्पयामासुः । केचित्तु एतादृशाः शब्दा भाषायां व्यवहारपथमनुप्रविष्टाः, यथा शिष्टैरुच्चार्यन्ते तथैव ग्राह्या इति, तेषामव्युत्पत्तत्वात् व्युत्पत्तिर्न कल्याणीयेति च मेनिरे । शाकटायनादयः, सर्वेषां शब्दानामवयवार्थप्रतीतिनिरपेक्षां व्युत्पत्तिं येन केनापि प्रकारेण व्याचक्षते । लोपागमवर्णविकारादींश्च यथेच्छं कल्पयन्ति । तदाहुः —

“संज्ञासु धातुरूपाणि प्रत्ययाश्च ततः परे ।

कार्याद्विद्यादनुबन्धमेतच्छास्त्रमुणादिषु ॥” इति ।

पाणिनिरिदं न क्षमते । अत एव रूढ्या सिद्धे चातुरर्थिकं प्रत्ययं नेच्छति । प्रत्ययस्याभावात् लुपमपि प्रत्याचष्टे । यत्र त्ववयवार्थः प्रतीयते, तत्र 'वाक्' 'गीः' इत्यादौ अश्रयमाणत्वादसन्तमपि प्रत्ययं कल्पयति ; धातोः कृदन्तत्वमापाद्य प्रातिपदिकत्वं साधयति ; सोर्लेपं विधाय सुगन्तत्वात् पदत्वं प्रापयति । एषा सर्वा कल्पना प्रतीतार्थकत्वादुपपद्यते । व्युत्पत्तिविषये ऐषा पाणिनेर्दृष्टिः । निरुक्तकारो महर्षिर्यास्कः, प्रथमाध्यायस्य चतुर्थपादे व्युत्पत्तिं विचारयति । शाकटायनस्य मतमनुवदन्नयमाह —

‘इमानि चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्याते उपसर्गनिपाताश्च । तत्र नामानि आख्यातजानीति शाकटायनः । नैरुक्तसमयः च । न सर्वाणीति गार्ग्यः, वैयाकरणानां चैके’<sup>१</sup> इति । उपसर्गा अपि निपाता एव । निपाता अपि प्रातिपदिकानि भवन्ति । तस्मात् प्रातिपदिकं धातुरिति द्वावेव शब्दभेदौ (Parts of Speech) पाणिनिः स्वीकरोति । यास्कस्तु उपसर्गान् निपातांश्च पृथक् गृह्णाति । तथापि संज्ञापदानि (Nouns), विशेषाणि, सर्वनामानि च नामसु गणयति । एतानि च

नामानि सर्वाणि धातुजानीति शाकटायनो मेने । अत्र आख्यातशब्दो धातुपर्यायः । इदं गार्ग्यः प्रत्याचख्यौ । न हि सर्वाणि नामानि धातुजानि भवन्ति । अव्युत्पन्नानां प्रातिपदिकानामुपलभ्यमानत्वात् ।

ननु वयं सर्वानपि शब्दान् व्युत्पादयामः, भवान् यदि व्युत्पत्तिं न जानाति तर्हि वयं व्याख्यास्यामः, तत्कथमव्युत्पन्नं नाम संभवतीति शङ्कायामाह गार्ग्यः —

‘तद् यत्र स्वरसंस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेन अन्वितौ स्यातां, [तत् सर्वं प्रादेशिकम्], संविज्ञातानि तानि । यथा गौरश्वः पुरुषो हस्तीति’ इति । अस्यायमाशयः । सन्ति केचित् धातुजाः शब्दाः । तेषु प्रकृत्यर्थः प्रत्ययार्थश्च उपलभ्येते । अयं प्रादेशिको गुण उच्यते कश्चित् तत्र प्रसिद्धः (उदाहरणान्तरेषु बहुषु दृष्टः) प्रत्ययस्तत्संनियोगेन च कश्चित् गृण-वृद्धि-संप्रसारणादिरूपो विकारः स्पष्टतया दृश्यते । एवमयत्रार्थप्रतीतौ सत्यामन्वितार्थकत्वात् कारकः कर्ता पाचकः सोमयाजी भुक्तिरित्यादिषु शब्देषु व्युत्पत्तिः कल्प्यते । किंतु गौः, अश्वः, पुरुषः, हस्ती इत्येवमादिषु संविज्ञातेषु [रूढिवशात् प्रसिद्धार्थकेषु] शब्देषु व्युत्पत्तिर्न कल्पनीया । गच्छतीति गोः । गमेडोस् । अध्वानमश्नुते इति अश्वः अश्नोतेर्वः कर्तरि । पुरि शेते इति पुरुषः । अत्र नवद्वारं पुरं देह एव ; तत्र वसन् जीवः पुरुष उच्यते । तथाच सप्तम्या अलुक् इकारस्य स्थाने उकारः शेतेर्डः, डित्वादभस्यापि टेलोपः, तालव्यस्यापि शकारस्य स्थाने मूर्धन्यादेश इत्येतावत् कल्पनीयम् । हस्तः शुण्डादण्डोऽस्यास्तीति हस्ती । अत इनि ठनौ । यद्यप्ययं शब्दस्तद्धितान्तः, तथापि न धातुज इत्येतावति तात्पर्यम् । एते च शब्दाः स्वार्थे रूढत्वात् अवयवार्थस्य चात्र अप्रतीतेः न व्युत्पत्तिमपेक्षन्ते इति भावः ।

नन्वस्माभिरमोषां शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिर्देशितैव तस्या अस्वीकारे किं कारणमिति चेदत्राह गार्ग्यः —

‘अथ चेत्सर्वाणि आख्यातजानि नामानि स्युः । यः कः च तत् कर्म कुर्यात् सर्वं तत्सत्त्वं तथा अचक्षीरन् । यः कः च अध्वानमश्नुवीत, अश्वः स वचनीयः स्यात् । यत् किञ्चित् तृन्यात्, तृणं तत् । अथापि चेत् सर्वाणि आख्यातजानि नामानि स्युः, यावद्भिः भावैः संप्रयुज्येत, तावद्भ्यो नामधेयप्रतिलम्भः स्यात् । तत्र एवं स्थूणादरशया च अ सञ्जनी च स्यत् ।’

2. तत्रैव, पृ० 20.

3. तत्रैव, पृ. 20.

यदि अश्वादिषु शब्देषु अवयवार्थप्रतीतिरस्तीति आस्थीयते, तेन च रूढिमन-  
पेक्ष्य व्युत्पत्तिलभ्य एवार्थः स्वीक्रियते, तर्हि 'अध्वानमश्नुते इति अश्वः' इति व्युत्पत्ति-  
मनुरुध्य यत्सत्वमध्वानमश्नुते तत्सर्वमश्व इत्येव व्यपदिश्येत । गच्छतीति गौरिति-  
व्युत्पत्तौ यो यो गच्छति स सर्वोऽपि गौरिति संज्ञां लभेत । एवं तृणादिष्वपि अति-  
प्रसङ्गो बोध्यः । अत्र सर्वत्र रूढिमभ्युपेत्य योगस्य रूढ्या संकोचितत्वान्नातिप्रसङ्ग-  
इति व्यवस्थाप्यते चेत्तर्हि रूढिरपरिहार्यत्वात् तथैव विशिष्टार्थलाभे किं व्युत्पत्तिकल्पना-  
क्लेशेन ? न केवलमयं निरर्थकः क्लेशः, अपि तु व्युत्पत्तिसिद्ध्यर्थस्वीकारे,  
तन्मूलकसंज्ञास्वीकारे च कस्मिंचिद्रस्तुनि ये ये व्यापाराः [क्रिया, भावः इति  
व्यापार एवेच्यते] संभवन्ति तेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः तस्य वस्तुनो नानानामव्यपदेशः  
प्राप्नोतीति दोषः । तथा हि स्थूणा निरवन्त्यते । तस्मादियं द्रशया, आसञ्जनी  
इत्यपि कथ्येत । न चैवं व्यवहारमुपलभामहे । तेन सत्यपि क्रियायोगे तन्निमित्तकः संज्ञा  
व्यपदेशो न जायत इति स्पष्टम् । क्वचित्तु कांचित् क्रियामाश्रित्य शब्दः प्रवर्तते ।  
अगच्छन्नपि गौर्गौरेव, गच्छन्नप्यश्वो न गौर्भवति । तदेषा रूढानां शब्दानां  
व्युत्पत्तिर्न वक्तव्येति गार्ग्यो मन्यते ।

गौरश्वः पुरुष इत्यादिषु रूढिशब्देष्वपि व्युत्पत्तिस्वीकारे बाधकमेकमन्यं तर्कमपि  
गार्ग्य उपन्यस्यति । 'अथापि य एषां न्यायवान् कार्मनामिकः संस्कारः, यथा चापि  
प्रतीतार्थानि स्युः, तथा एनानि आचक्षीरन् । पुरुषं पुरिशय इत्यचक्षीरन् । अष्टा इति  
अश्वम् । तर्देनमिति तृणम् । अथापि निष्पन्ने अभिव्याहारे विचारयन्ति । पृथनात्  
पृथिवी इति आहुः । क एनामप्रथयिष्यत्, किमाधारः चेति ?' इति । एषा  
तावत् प्रबला युक्तिः । यदि पुरि शेते इति पुरुष इति व्युत्पत्तिराश्रीयते, पुरि शयनं  
चास्य प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमुच्यते, तर्हि पुरिशय इति व्यपदेशः कुतो न जायते ? एवं हि  
सति योगार्थस्य स्पष्टतरप्रतिपत्तिः संभवति । पुरुष इत्यत्र तु षत्वं कथं भवतीति  
चिन्तया शेतेर्धातोः प्रत्यभिज्ञानं प्रतिबध्यते । पुरि शेते इत्यर्थे स्मर्यन्ते उपपदे शेते-  
रच्, सप्तम्या अलुक्, इकारस्य स्थाने उकारः तालव्यस्यापि शकारस्य षत्वमचि च  
शेतेष्टिलोप इत्येतावत् कल्पनीयम् । एवं कल्प्यमानेऽपि अनेनैव रूपेणार्थप्रतीति-  
नान्येनेति कथं निर्वन्ध इष्यते ? तस्मात् पुरुष इव पुरिशयोऽपि प्रयुज्येत । न तु  
प्रयुज्यते । तस्मादत्र योगार्थस्य विवक्षा नेति विज्ञायते । पुरुषशब्द एव चास्मिन्नर्थे  
रूढः । तेन पुरिशय इति शब्दस्य प्रयोगो नापादयितुं शक्यः, तस्य उक्तेऽर्थे  
अरूढत्वात् । अश्वुते इति अश्वः । अस्यां व्युत्पत्तौ स्वीकृतायां कर्तव्यः कल्पनीयः ।

न चायं प्रत्ययोऽन्यत्र दृश्यते । अथ इत्यत्र दृश्यत इति चेत्, सत्यम् । किन्तु यदि कर्त्तर्यकोऽयं प्रत्ययः - तर्हि अश्नोतेः कर्त्तरि तृचि 'अष्टा' इति शब्दं व्युत्पाद्य व्यवहियताम् । तृचः कर्त्तर्यकत्वं तावत् कर्ता हर्ता भर्ता श्रोता द्रष्टेत्यादिषु बहुषु शब्देषु दृष्टम् । तस्मात्प्रतीतिार्थकत्वात् प्रतीतिसौकर्यार्थमष्टा इत्येव व्यवहरेयुः, यदि योगार्थोऽत्र विवक्षितः स्यात् । अष्टा इति तु न व्यवहरन्ति ; प्रत्युत अश्वशब्दमेव प्रयुञ्जते । तेनेदमवगम्यते यदत्र अशू व्याप्तौ इति धातोरर्थो नाभिप्रेतः, संज्ञैवैषा प्राणिविशेषस्येति ।

अन्यदप्यत्र चिन्तनीयम् । पृथिवीं प्रथनात् व्युत्पादयन्ति । तत्र अवयवार्थो नोपपद्यते । को नाम पुरुषः पृथिवीं प्रथयामास ? कुत्र स्थितोऽयं प्रथयामास ? एषा व्युत्पत्तिसंगतार्थत्वादप्रामाणिकीति गार्थः । पृथिवीति रूढिस्त्रिद्वयोऽयं व्यवहारः । निष्पन्ने च व्यवहारे पश्चात् कथंचित् व्युत्पत्तिं कल्पयन्ति । तदेतन्न न्याय्यम् । असतः अत्रिवक्षितस्य वा अवयवार्थस्य ग्रहणे मानाभावात् ।

गार्थः शाकटायनेन प्रदर्शितां सत्यशब्दस्य व्युत्पत्तिं सयुक्तिकं निराकरोति । शाकटायनो हि सत्यशब्दे द्वौ खण्डौ कृत्वा, तयोर्द्वाभ्यां धातुभ्यां निष्पत्तिं साधयति । 'सत्' इति प्रथमः खण्डः । एष चस्तेः शतृप्रत्यये निष्पन्नः । अस्तीति सन् । द्वितीयः खण्डः 'य' इति । तं शाकटायनो णिजन्तादिण्धातोर्व्युत्पादयति । एतेर्णिचि णित्वादचो वृद्धौ 'आयि' इति भवति । तस्माच्चि कृत्प्रत्यये, णेरनिटीति णिलोपे, कथंचिदाकारस्यापि लोपे कृते 'य' इति रूपं निष्पद्यते । एतेर्गत्यर्थकत्वात्, सन्तं वास्तवमर्थं प्रापयतीत्यर्थे सत्यशब्दस्तेन कथंचिद् व्युत्पादितः । गार्थ आक्षिपति -

'अथ अनन्वितेऽर्थे अप्रादेशिके विकारे पदेभ्यः पदेतरार्थान् संचस्कार शाकटायनः । एतेः कारितं च यकारादि च अन्तकरणम् । अस्तेः शुद्धं च सकारादि च' इति । कारितमिति प्रेरणार्थकं णिजन्तं रूपमुच्यते । यास्कोऽपि गार्थस्येदं वचनं समञ्जसं मेने । अत एव, 'यथो एतत् । पदेभ्यः पदेतरार्थान् संचस्कार इति । यः अनन्विते अर्थे संचस्कार, स तेन गृह्यः । सा एषा पुरुषगर्हा' इति शाकटायनस्य दोषमङ्गीचकार । कथंचिद् व्युत्पत्तिः कल्पनीयेत्याग्रहस्य फलमेतत् ।

यास्कोऽपि द्वितीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमपादे एवमाह - 'अथ निर्वचनम् । तद् येषु पदेषु स्वसंस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेन अन्वितौ स्यातां, तथा तानि निर्ब्रूयात् ।



अथ अनन्विते अर्थे अप्रादेशिके विकारे अर्थनित्यः परोक्षेत् केनचिद् वृत्तिसामान्येन । अविद्यमाने सामान्येऽपि अक्षरवर्णसामान्यात् निर्ब्रूयात् । न त्वेव न निर्ब्रूयात् । न संस्कारमाद्रियेत । विशयवत्यो हि वृत्तयो भवन्ति । यथार्थं विभक्तीः संनमयेत्' इति ।<sup>६</sup>

अनन्वितेऽप्यर्थे यास्कः व्युत्पत्तिं कल्पनीयां मन्यते । असत्यपि रूपसामान्ये, अक्षरसाम्याद्वर्णसाम्याद्वा कस्माच्चिद्धातोः कंचित्प्रत्ययं कल्पयित्वा येन केनापि प्रकारेण शब्दा व्युत्पादीता एव । 'न त्वेव न निर्ब्रूया' दिति द्वाभ्यां नञ्भ्यां निर्वचनस्य अत्यावश्यकत्वं समर्थयते । एवं स्वयमुपदिशन्नपि शाकटायनोक्तां व्युत्पत्तिं खण्डयति ; 'सा एषा पुरुषगर्हा' इति तस्य दोषं प्रकाशयति । वस्तुतस्तु गार्ग्यस्य मतमेवात्र समीचीनमिति संप्रतीमः । तदेव च भगवान् पाणिनिरपि अनुसरतीति स्पष्टमदर्शयाम ।

6. तत्रैव पृ. 35.

## 1. सूत्रसंदर्भः

१. अनद्यतने लङ् 3.2.111.
२. परोक्षे लिट् 3.2.115.
३. गोस्त्रियोरुपसर्जनस्य 1.2.48.
४. प्रत्ययस्य लुक्लुलुपः 1.1.61.
५. न लुमताङ्गस्य 1.1.63.
६. परवल्लिङ्गं द्वन्द्वतत्पुरुषयोः 2.4.26.
७. स्त्रियां किल् 3.3.94.
८. नपुंसके भावे क्तः 3.3.114.
९. धृषोदरादीनि यथोपदिष्टम् 6.3.109.
१०. उणादयो बहुलम् 3.3.1.
११. ते तद्वज्रः 4.1.174.

## 2 ग्रन्थक्रमम्

१. सिद्धान्तकौमुदी - तत्त्वबोधिनीसहिता  
निर्णयसागरसंस्करणम्, 1929.
२. हिन्दीनिरुक्तम्, चौखाम्बासंस्करणम्, 1961.
३. महाभाष्यम्, प्रदीपोद्योतसहितम्,  
काशीसंस्करणम्, संवत् 1995.

## కరుణాద్భుతము

ఇది ఉత్తర రామచరిత్రలోని యంగిరసము.

భవభూతి రచన విచిత్ర శైలీలము. అది జ్వలంతేజము. కాళిదాసుకైలి సుకుమార రమ్యము. అది పురుష సౌందర్యము. ఇది స్త్రీ సౌందర్యము. అది వ్యాసమార్గము. ఇది వాల్మీకి సర్గము. ఈ శైలీవిభేదములు ప్రాచ్య పాశ్చాత్యులు గుర్తించిరి. కుంతకుడు తన వక్రోక్తిజీవితమున సుకుమార విచిత్ర శైలీవిచారణ సుష్ఠుగా చేసెను. అట్లే పాశ్చాత్య సాహితీ విమర్శకులు, చిత్రకారులు దీనిని గుర్తించిరి. Cezanne అన్న చిత్ర కారుని బొమ్మలను గుఱించి

— If there is plenty of male potency in his (Cezanne's) work, it is because he does not let it evaporate in merry making."

— Van Gogh.

వ్యాసుని గుఱించి శ్రీ అరవిందులు తమ Vyasa and Valmiki అన్న గ్రంథమున Vyasa is the most masculine of all writers (p. 11) అని వ్రాసి Coleridge కీ రెండు శైలులు తెలిసియున్నట్లు వివరించిరి. మైఖేల్ ఏంగిలో శిల్పాలను గుఱించి విమర్శకులు Heroic Style అని పేర్కొన్నారు. భవభూతిని గుఱించి వాక్స్పతిరాజు

భవభూతిజలధి నిర్గత కావ్యామృత రసకణా ఇవ స్ఫురంతి  
యస్య విశేషా ఆద్యాని వికచేష కథానివేశేషు —

అని కీర్తించుటలో నాతని వికటకథానివేశనము ప్రధానాంశముగా గుర్తించెను. వికటమనగా విచిత్రమే. ఇది శబ్దమునుండి రసముదనుక వ్యాపించి యనున్మాతముగా దృశ్యాదృశ్య రూపమున నుండును. ఈ వైచిత్రీ కవివనోగతమై ఆతని వ్యక్తిత్వము (Personality) నుండి ఊడివడును. కొందఱు కవులు వ్యక్తిత్వమును రచనక్రింద పాతివేసెదరు. అచట మాధుర్యముండును. వ్యక్తిత్వ పరివేష్టితమై శబ్ద మవతరించినచో వచట వైలక్షణ్యముండును.

ఇది అద్భుతావహము. మాదుర్యమున్నచో సుకుమారశైలి, శ్రీ సౌందర్యము, ఉద్యానవన శోభ. అద్భుతమున్నచో విచిత్రశైలి, పురుష సౌందర్యము, ఆరణ్యక శోభ.

అద్భుతస్థాయి విస్మయమును గూర్చి వ్రాయుచు శ్రీమదభినవులు

‘విస్మయస్య విరసుసంధానతటిత్తుల్య సుఖరూపతా’

(నాట్య. కా. 1.119)

ఇట్లన్నారు. మెఱుపును చూడలేము, కళ్ళు జిగేయమనును. కాని చూతుము.

ఇట్టి యొకానొక విచిత్రలక్షణము విస్మయమునందున్నది. ఈ లక్షణము శైలి యందున్నచో నది యద్భుత-విచిత్ర-ప్రౌఢ-జైత్ర శైలి.

జైత్రత దంతురత్వదృష్ట్యా, ఆక్రమణశీలదృష్ట్యా, మనస్సులో విస్మయమును కలిగించునట్టి గుణముకలది వికటశైలి.

ఇది మనోవైలక్షణ్యము ననుసరించి పుట్టును కావున నటనుండి ఎన్ని కావ్యనదులు జాలవారినను లోతట్టున నద్భుతముండి తీరును. ఈ శైలీ మార్గమిట్టిదని గుర్తించి శాస్త్రకారునివలె తల్తల్లక్షణముల నెడనెడ తన కావ్యములందు భవభూతి విత్తినాడు.

ఆతని మహావీరచరిత్రలో వీరాద్భుతము రసమట (ప్రస్తావన).

ఆతని మాలతీమాధవమున శృంగారాద్భుతము రసమట (నాటకాంతమున నిట్టి యద్భుతప్రకరణమొందేది కలదా యని పాత్రచే ననిపించును.)

ఆతని ఉత్తరరామచరిత్రలో కరుణాద్భుతము రసమట.

దీని నెచట చెప్పెను ? సప్తమాంకమందలి అంతర్నాటికా ప్రారంభమున సూత్రధారుడు

—భగవతా భూతార్థవాదీ ప్రాచేతనః సస్థావరజంగమం జగ

దాజ్ఞాయపతి “యదిదమారేణ చక్షుషా సముద్వీక్ష్య

పావనం చ కరుణాద్భుతరసం చ కించిదుపనిబద్ధం

తత్ర కార్యగౌరవాదవధాతవ్య” మితి —

అంతర్నాటకము ప్రధాన నాటకముయొక్క సూక్ష్మీకరణము. అంతర్నాటక విపులీ రణమే ప్రధాన నాటకము. కావున కరుణాద్భుతమున్న మాట వాల్మీకికృతమైన గర్భాంక నాటకమునకు విస్తృతరూపమైన భవభూతికృత నాటకమునకు సమన్వయించుచున్నది. ఇందుచేతనే భరతవాక్యమునందు ‘శబ్దబ్రహ్మవిదః కమేః పరిణతప్రజ్ఞస్య వాణీమిమామ్’ — అని చెప్పుట. శబ్దబ్రహ్మవిదుడు వాల్మీకియు కానును. ఈ సమన్వయముండుటచేతనే సప్తమాంకము సమ్మేళన నామకమైనది. కావున కరుణాద్భుతశబ్దము మహానాటకమందలి ప్రధానరసమునకు సూచకమే.

అద్భుతముచే నుత్తరశీకృతమైన కరుణ కరుణాద్భుతము. అనగా నద్భుతమైన కరుణము అద్భుతమును ప్రధానరసముగా భట్టనారాయణుడు చెప్పినట్లు సాహిత్యదర్పణము.

‘రసము చమత్కారసారము. చమత్కారమున సారమద్భుతము’

ఇది భట్టనారాయణ సిద్ధాంతము. ఇది భవభూతి మనోలక్షణమందున్నది. అద్భుతము నేపథ్యముననుండి రంగమున కరుణమున్నది. అదివచ్చి దీనిని పోషించును. ఇదిపోయి దానిని తాకును ఈ స్పర్థ (Contrast) రసములందున్నచో నదొక విచిత్ర చమత్కారము.

ఈ విషయము భవభూతికి తెలియును. కావుననే పంచమాంకమున లవుడు చంద్రకేతునితో యుద్ధమాడువేళ

‘హంత మిశ్రీభూతో రసో వర్తతే’ — అన్నాడు రసములు మిశ్రీభూతము లగుట యనగా పరస్పరస్పర్థ పెరుగుట ఈ స్పర్థాయామే సాహిత్యము. శబ్దార్థ స్పర్థయే వక్రిత యన్నాడు కుంతకుడు ఈ రహస్యము శాస్త్రీయము. దీనిని నాటకమున కెక్కించినవాడు భవభూతి. తత్పూర్వమిది లేదు. కుందమాల సుకుమారశైలీమన్మథము. అందా లక్షణము లేదు కావున.

దారుణరసః స్నేహాశ్రమః బాధతే — అని పరస్పరము చూచుకొనుచు చంద్రకేతు లవులనుకొన్నారట. ఈ స్పర్థనుండి అద్భుతము వుట్టును. ఇది రచనలో సర్వత్ర భాసించి ఆంగిరసము నుద్దీప్తము కావించినచో నది శృంగారాద్భుతము — ఇత్యాదులగును. కావున కరుణాద్భుతము నట్లు చూడవలెను.

ఈ అద్భుతము శబ్ద, వర్ణన, కథా, సన్నివేశ, పాత్రాది నిర్మాణములందున్నది వికటకథ యన్నాడుగదా వ్యాతిరాజు. కుందమాలకు దీనికిగల భేదమును చూచినచో వైకట్యము, సౌకుమార్యము బోధపడును. దేవతలు, నదులు పాత్రలగుట, కథయంతయు వాల్మీకి పవిత్రాశ్రమమున జరుగుట, అంతర్నాటికా నిర్మాణము — ఇవన్నియు కలిసి యద్భుతానుభూతిని కల్పించు నేపథ్య రచన. చిత్రకారులు Back ground చే Fore ground న కుద్దీప్తి కల్గించుట సుప్రసిద్ధమే కదా. The immaculate conception, The virgin of the Rocks — పంటి చిత్రాలను చూడవచ్చును.

మొదటిదానిలో ఆపన్నసత్త్వ మేరీ నడుమనుండగా, చుట్టు వృత్తాకారమున దివ్యశిశువులు మండలప్రమణము చేయుచు నాకాశమున తేలియాడుచున్నట్లు — రెండవదానిలో గుహలు నేపథ్యమున సహజ భయానక సౌందర్యము సంతరించుచు వాని ముందున్న మేరీ శిశువు — ఇత్యాది పాత్రలను పోషించుచున్నవి. కావున నద్భుత మిట్లుండును.

భవభూతి చాచోట్ల నాటకిరసమును సూచించెను. షష్ఠాంకమున అవుని చూచి నవుడు రాముడనుకొన్న మాటలు —

“లోకమున ప్రియజన సంబంధ సంయోగము సుఖహేతుకము. వియోగము దుఃఖకారకము నగుట సహజము నాకు సంభవించిన యీ వియోగమో ఆశ్చర్య ప్రవాహమున దేలియారు నా హృదయమునకు సుఖదుఃఖములు రెంటినిగూడ గలిగించుచున్నది.” (మల్లాదివారి గ్రంథము, పుట 86) ఇది కేవల కరుణమా ? అదేదో అద్భుతముగా నున్నదట. ఏదో బాధ లౌకికము కానిది. ఏదో ఆశ్చర్యముగా ననుభూతమగుచున్నది. ఏమిటిది ?

అట్లే అంతర్బాటకమున జ్యోభకాస్త్రావిర్భావ సమయమున

జీభిః కామపి దశాం కుర్వంతి మమ సాంప్రతమ్

విస్మయానంద సందర్భ జర్జరాః కరుణోర్మయః. 7-12

కరుణవీచికలు విస్మయానంద సమావేశమున పెళ్ళలు విటిగి నాకేదో చెప్పరలవికాని దశను కల్పించుచున్నవన్నాడు రాముడు.

కరుణ మద్భుతముచే పెళ్ళలు విటిగిపడుచున్నది. కరుణ అద్భుతముచే కోయ బడుచున్నది. జీభితమగుచున్నది. అది ఆనందమా ? దుఃఖమా ? దానికి పేరేమి ? ఏదో చిత్రముగా ఆర్తిమయముగా నున్న మనోవృత్తి - దశ. అది కరుణాద్భుతము. అద్భుత - దివ్య - ఆలౌకిక కరుణము.

ఇట్టి మాటలన్నియు నామకద్వారముననే కవి వెల్లడించుట చూడగా భవభూతి అంతర హృదయ సంపేదనమే రామపాత్రగా రూపుదాల్చినట్లున్నది. ఇందుచే నీ కరుణాద్భుతము శాస్త్రీయకవిషయముకాని నవరసాలలోని కేవల కరుణ కాదు.

నాయకస్య కవేశ్రోతః సమానోఽనుభవస్తతః - యన్న భట్టతౌతుని సూక్తి ననుసరించి కావ్యపఠనవేళ ప్రేక్షకుడు పొందు ననుభూతిపారమ్యమునే కవి పాత్రముఖమున స్పష్టము చేయుచున్నాడు.

లౌకికశోకము ఇష్టజనవియోగాదులచే పుట్టును. రామ శోకమట్టిదికాదు. అది సీతయున్నపుడును రామచంద్రునకున్నది. ఆమె పోయినను ఉన్నది. ఆమె సాన్నిధ్యా సాన్నిధ్యములందు రామునకా శోకముండనేయున్నది. ప్రభుమాంకమున సీతాస్మర్యనంది రాముడన్న

“వినిశ్చేతుం శక్యోన సుఖమితి వా దుఃఖమితి వా” - శ్లోకమునందలి అనుభవ పరమార్థము కరుణాద్భుతము. ఇది భవభూతికవి కల్పించిన క్రొత్తరసము.

“ఏకోరణః కరుణ ఏవ” - అనుట యిందులకే. దీనిని కొందఱుచే యంకమునకు సమన్వయించిరి. కొందఱు నాటకమునకంతటికి సమన్వయించిరి. కాని నిజానికది కావ్య

సృష్టికి బీజమైన కవి హృదయగత దివ్యవేదన. ఈ బాధ ప్రతిపదమున కవి వెల్లడించును. రామునకు ప్రత్యంగుళమిది అనుభవ దశయందే యున్నది.

వ్యతిషజతి పదార్థానాంతరః కోపిహేతుః — అన్న మాటలోను ఏదో ఆలోచిక వేదనధ్వనులు ఎక్కడో అంతరాంతరములందు దూరదూరముగ వినిపించుచున్నవి. తాత్త్విక సీమలనుండి వినిపించుచున్నవి.

Elgreco చిత్రకారువాక చిత్రమువేసెను. The Burial of count Orgaz — అని దా - పేరు. బొమ్మకు అడుగుబాగమున శవము ఖననము చేయబడుచున్నట్లు, పై బాగమున భగవంతుని కొలుపున్నట్లు చిత్రించెను. దీనినిగూర్చి Herbert Read అన్నాడు

— 'the Painter reaches a depth of religious pathos' అని. ఇంచుమించునిది ప్రేదానివంటిది, తాత్త్విక సంవేదన.

King Lear కిరుణ లోకికము. రాజుచేసిన పొరపాటునుండి పుట్టుకొనివచ్చిన దుఃఖము. ఇటనట్లుకాదు. ఒక ప్రక్క రాజ్యధర్మము. మరొక ప్రక్క స్వధర్మము, గృహస్థాశ్రమము రాజు కవున సతని దృష్టిలో రాజధర్మము గొప్పదిఃను? సీతను వదలినాడు. ఈ ధర్మ సంఘర్షణమునుండి పుట్టింది కనుక దుఃఖము ధార్మిక కరుణము. అప్పుత సన్నివేశమునుండి - ధర్మస్థానమునుండి పుట్టిన శోకము. కరుణాద్భుతమన్నను దోషముకాదు. అప్పుడిది ఆలంకారిక కరుణ. ఇది ప్రేదానిని పోషించుచున్నది. పైనిచెప్పిన హృదయసంవేదనస్థాయి. ఇది తడదీసనము.

ఇట్లు నేపథ్యమున ధర్మమయమైన వాతావరణము - తాత్త్వికదృష్టి యుండగా నందుండి పొడుచుకొనివచ్చిన కరుణ కరుణాద్భుతము. అది కేవల కరుణ కాదనుటలో నాట్యశాస్త్రము చెప్పిన కరుణ దృష్టికి లగించదని స్పష్టపడుచుండగా కేవల కరుణ వాదము కాని, కరుణ విప్రలంభవాదముకాని, ధర్మవీర వాదముకాని నిలువదు. కొంత కరుణ రస వాదము సమన్వితమగును.

ధర్మవీరము యుద్ధకాండతోడనే ముగిసెను. ఇందుకే మహావీరచరిత్ర, తదనుసారి అనర్హరాఘవమునందు వీరాశ్చుతము రసమని కవులే సిద్ధేశించిరి. అద్భుతము రామ పరాక్రమ గతమే కాక ధర్మపరాక్రమ నిష్ఠము. అనిధారావ్రతమువంటి ధర్మ విర్వహణమున రామునకు వెనుకడుగులేదు. కావున అద్భుత శబ్దము రామసత్య పరాక్రమ నిష్ఠము. ఇందుచేతనే పైన ధర్మస్థానము నుండి పుట్టినది కావున కరుణము కరుణాద్భుతమైనదనుట.

కావున ఆ తరకాండలో ధర్మవీర మన్వయించః పోవుటయే కాక అది పునాదిగా నిది పుట్టినది. అది నేపథ్యమున నొకానొక యంశమాత్రమే. అది మూలముగా గ్రహించు

చియే నదీ దేవతాదులు పాత్రలై రాముని కరుణచుట్టు మండలభ్రమణ చేసినవనుట. కరుణ విప్రలంభవాదులు చూసిన ఉపపత్తులును కుమరనివే. నాటకమున స్వప్నవాసవదత్తాదు లందున్న మాధుర్యములేదు. విప్రలంభమున మాధుర్యముండవలెను గావున. కరుణ విప్ర లంభము రసమైనచో శోకమున రతిమాధుర్య స్పర్శ యుండితీరవలెను. కుందమాటలో సీతో త్తరీయము లభించినపుడు రాముడన్న యీ మాట

వణము జూరాన, ప్రణయ భేలనవుఁ గంత

పాశము, రతాంత సంతాప వాఁణమగు

తాళనృతము. యామినీ వేళక లహ

శయ్య, హరిజాక్షి పట మదృష్టమున దొరకె —.

విప్రలంభ మాధుర్యము నివతళించుచున్నది. ఇట్టిమాటలు రాముడన్నట్లు భవభూతి వ్రాయ లేదు. ఒక వేళ నిది కరుణ విప్రలంభము కాన దుఃఖపు పాశైక్యవయన్నిదో సతీసంయో గము లభించునన్న ఊహలో నైతము లప దర్శనాది సంఘటనములందు రామభావనలో మాధుర్యము లేదని ముందే వ్రాయబడినది. నాటకముందెల్లెడల మనోవైక్లబ్ధమే పఠమకాని యున్నది. ఆ వైక్లబ్ధము జీవుని కుదిరించివేయునట్టిది. ఆ ర్థిమయనిగా చిత్రించి అంత ర్దర్శమును ప్రసారికదృష్టి కలవానిగా చేయునట్టిది. అలలాభావము లౌకిక భాషలోనికి తెచ్చుటకు వీలులేనిది. రామునికే తెలియని దళకదా అనగా కవికిని తెలియదు. గ్రుడ్డిలో మెల్లగా కరుణాచుతమన్నాడు. ఈ శబ్దము దానికి నిదానము (Symbol). వాచ కము కాదు. అతీంద్రియమైన పర్యుత్సకత.

రమ్యాణీ వీక్ష్య మధురాంశ్చ నిశమ్య శబ్దాన్

పర్యుత్సకో భవతి యత్సుఖితోఽపి జంతుః

తచ్చేతసా స్మరతి నూనమబోధహర్షం

భాషస్థితాణి జననాంతర సౌహృదాని —

అనికదా కవికులగురువు సూక్తి. ఇది భావుకదృష్ట్యా చెప్పబడినది ఇచటి పర్యుత్సకత పాతకునికి కల్గినట్టిది. భవభూతి కవిలోని పర్యుత్సకతను చెప్పుచున్నాడు. ఇది అనులోమ విషయము. సృష్టి విషయము. అది విలోమ ప్రళయ విషయము. రెండు నొకటే. కలిసియే సరస్వతీతత్త్వము. అది కవి సహృదయాభ్యుమని కదా అభినవుల వాణి.

కొందఱున్నారు శృంగార వీరములే నాటకమున సంగరసాహుగా నిక్షేపించవలె నన్న యాలంకారిక సూక్తి ననుసరించి కరుణ కుమరదని. ఇది వట్టి భ్రాంతి శాస్త్రదృష్టితో కవి వ్రాయునా ? కవి సృష్టితో శాస్త్రము పుట్టినా ? కాక అకరుణ నవరసాలలోనిది కాదుకదా. నాగాసందమున్నది కదా. అది శాంతప్రధానమని కదా గుప్తులవాదము. కాక శృంగార వీర ప్రాధాన్యవాదము భవభూతి కీవల పుట్టినదికాని ముందటిదికాదే. ఇంకేకాక మహాభారతములు రామాయణ, మహాభారతములందు వీరమా శృంగారమా ? — అని

శ్రవ్యములన్నిచో దృశ్యశ్రవ్యములకు పర్యవసానమున భేదముగ్నదా ?

ఇట్టి వాదములకిన్నిటికి మూలము అంతర్నాటకము. అందు సీతారాములు పునస్సగామమందినట్లు ఘటించబడినది. ఇందుచే కరుణ విలంబం. ధర్మవీరముల కూత దొంకినది.

అంతర్నాటక ప్రారంభాంతములందు కవి నాయకునిచే రెండు వాక్యములనిపించెను. సూత్రచారుడు వచ్చి కరుణాద్యుత్తరసాత్మక నాటకమని చెప్పిన వెంటనే సభావతి రాముడు —

ఏతదుక్తం భవతి 'సాక్షాత్కృతధర్మాణో మహర్షయః  
తేషామమృతసారాణి పరోజాంసి ప్రజ్ఞానాని న క్విచిదపి  
వ్యాహస్యం తే ఇత్యనభిశంకియానీ'తి.

అంతమున

'స్వమిద మనుభవన్నపి న ప్రత్యేషు —

యద్వా ప్రకృతిరియ మఖ్యదయానాం —

ఈ కావ్యార్థమున సత్యాసత్యశంకి కూడదు. అని మొదట అనుభవించుచున్నను నాకు విశ్వాసము కుదురకున్నది ఇది శ్రేయస్సుల స్వభావము కాబోలు — నని చివర రాముని మాటలు. వీనికి నడుమ అంతర్నాటకమున్నది. అసలు ముందటి వాక్యమును రాముడనవలసిన అవసరమేమి ? అది లేనిచో సప్తమా ? దానికర్థమేదని యున్నచో రాబోవు నాటకము నా దృష్టితో చూడవలెనని నిర్దేశము. ఇది సత్యాసత్యముల కలయిక కాదు. కేవల కల్పనము, అమూలకము దీనికి వస్తవిక కథాంగత్వము పట్టదు. అదొక దానికి నిదానము. దేనికి ?

ఋద్ధివిలాసాదిభిర్గుణైశ్చ — అన్న రూపకలక్షణము ననుసరించి అర్థకామముతో నాటకము కూడుకొని యుండవలెనని తెలియుచున్నది. నాటకము దీనితో ముగియవలయును. రూపకము ప్రేక్షకునిలో లోకమ దనురక్తిని సృష్టించునేకాని, ప్రోత్సహించునేకాని విరక్తిని పెంచదు. సాహిత్య పరమార్థమిదే. దీనికి నాటకశాస్త్రమే చాలినంత సాక్ష్యమిచ్చుచున్నది. నాటకాంశమున నాయకుడు దుఃఖమునే పొందినట్లు నిరూపించినచో సామాన్య ప్రేక్షకుని (ప్రేక్షకులలో రెండు రకాలు. కథా నిబద్ధబుద్ధులు. రసమగ్న హృదయులు. వారికి కథ. వీరికి ఆలంకారిక శాస్త్ర విషయములు. ఇందుచే వారు లౌకికులు. వ్యావహారిక లోకావతీతబుద్ధులు. వీరు శాస్త్రబుద్ధులు.) హృదయము విరసీకృతమై పగిలి పోవును. నాటకమంతయు దుఃఖము తెచ్చిపెట్టుటకాయన్న భావమాతని కుదయించుటయే తత్కారణము ఇందుచే నాటకము సుఖాంతము కావలెను

అరిస్టోటిల్ ట్రాజెడీ లక్షణమున 'విది సుఖాంతమైనను దుఃఖాంతమైనను ట్రాజెడీ ట్రాజెడీయే' — యన్నాడు.



"At the out set it must be repeated that, for the Greek's, tragedy need not end in disaster. It must include scenes of pain and sorrow, but it need not close with one though it usually did. The essence of tragedy was that it handled serious actions or serious characters".

— *Tragedy*, F.L. Lucas, p. 24.

ఇట్లు వ్రాసి పై గ్రంథకర్త అదోక్షాపికలో అరిస్టోటిల్, ట్రాజెడీ దుఃఖాంతము కావలెనని అంగీకరించినను, మంగళాంతమున పైతమంగీకరించెనను నర్థముగల యీ వాక్యమును వ్రాసెను.

"The second more satisfying to our human sympathies."

భరతుడు చెప్పిన ఓదియే. నాటకమొక వేళ మంగళాంతమైనను పూర్వ రసమునకు దోషములేదు.

నాగానంద నాటకమున దశరూపకావలోకకర్త స్థాపించిన దయావీరమును ఖండించుచు గుప్తపాదులు నాయకునకు విద్యాధరచక్రవర్తిత్వము, పాణిగ్రహణము నాటకాంతమున ఘటింపబడుట ముని చెప్పిన 'ఋద్ధివిలాసాది' — యే కారణమని చెప్పి శాంతమును స్థాపించెను.

ఈ దృష్టితో ఉత్తరరామచరిత్రలోని అంతర్నాటకమును చూడవలెను. అప్పుడు కరుణవిప్రలంభ, ధర్మవీరములకు కావులేదు. కర్మార్కర్ మొదలగువారు గర్భాంకము నతుకని యీనడించిరి. అది నిదానదృష్టితో గ్రహించిన నీ వాదములన్నియు నుండవు.

అంతర్నాటకమున కరుణమొక ప్రక్క ప్రధానమై యుండగా దానిని పోషించుచు నదృశ్యమున్నగదా అది కరుణాదృశ్యమగుట పొసగును. అదృశ్యమెట్లు సాధించెను.

నాటకమును చూచుచు రాముడనుకొన్న మాట

అదృశ్యతరం కి మసి — ఈ మాటతో నాటకమున జ్వంభితాత్మ వ్రాదుర్భూతి ఘట్టము వచ్చెను

సీత జాహ్నువీ జలములనుండి పైకి వచ్చునపుడు — తెరలో — 'అత్యదృశ్యమును జిత్రగింపు'డన్న మాటతో — సీత జలమునుండి ధాత్రీ జాహ్నువీ దేవులతో రంగమున నవతరించుట. ఈ కల్పనచే — పాత్రలచే కరుణ ముప్పుక పుష్టమగుచున్నది ఇదే ప్రధాన నాటకమున కన్వమించును. పాత్ర, కథానన్నివేశాది నిర్మాణముచే నదృశ్యము రూపొందుచున్నది. కావున ప్రధాన నాటక — అంతర్నాటక సమ్మేళనము — నాయకానాయక సమ్మేళనము — భవభూతి వాల్మీకి సమ్మేళనము — లచే నీ యంకము సమ్మేళనామాంకమగుట యదృశ్యము.

విచిత్ర శైలిరక్షణ మందొక ప్రత్యేక లక్షణము రసాదులు తాత్త్వికషయముతో లగించుట. విచిత్రశైలి ప్రయోజనమును తాత్త్వికతలే వ్యాసభవభూతులు, తిక్కన, శ్రీకృష్ణరాయాదులు. వీరంజయందొకే లక్షణమున్నది. కావ్య విషయమున తత్త్వముతో ముడిపెట్టుట. కాగా కరుణాదృశ్యము తాత్త్విక విషయము. దీనిని కాదముఖ విచిత్రశైలీలమును గుర్తింపకుండుట.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr. K. Krishna Moorthy .. Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit,  
Karnatak University,  
Dharwar
2. Dr. Siddheshwar Varma ... Hon. Academic Advisor,  
Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research  
Institute,  
Chandigarh
3. Sri Jagannath Agrawal ... 593, Sector 18,  
Chandigarh
4. Sri D. Satyanarayana ... Librarian, Kendriya Sanskrit  
Vidyapeetha,  
Tirupati
5. Sri Sadhu Ram ... 986, Shivaji Street,  
Karolbagh,  
New Delhi-5
6. Dr. K.S. Ramamurti ... Lecturer in Sanskrit & Curator-  
in-charge,  
S.V.U.O.R. Institute,  
Tirupati
7. Dr. M.S. Narayana Murti ... Lecturer in Sanskrit,  
S.V.U.O.R. Institute,  
Tirupati
8. Dr. Ram Dutt Sharma ... Department of Sanskrit,  
Kamala Nehru College, Jatauli,  
P.O. Hailymandi (Gurgaon),  
Haryana
9. Dr. V. Varadachari ... Reader in Sanskrit,  
S.V.University,  
Tirupati
10. Sri K. Achyuta Potuval ... Principal,  
Maharaja's Sanskrit College,  
Trippunithura,  
Ernakulam Dt., Kerala
11. Dr. V. Krishnaswami Iyengar ... Reader,  
Central Hindi Institute,  
Agra-5
12. Dr. T. Kotiswara Rao ... Lecturer in Telugu,  
S.V.University,  
Tirupati



**PUBLICATIONS OF  
S.V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
TIRUPATI**

The following is the list of publications available for sale at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles in English, Sanskrit and Telugu. In some of the numbers articles in Tamil or Hindi also are published.

S.No.	Particulars of Work	Price
		Rs. Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal Vol. I Parts 1 & 2 (1958)	10-00
2.	-do- Vol. VII Parts 1 & 2 (1964)	10-00
3.	-do- Vol. VIII Parts 1 & 2 (1965)	10-00
4.	-do- Vol. IX Parts 1 & 2 (1966)	10-00
5.	-do- Vol. X Parts 1 & 2 (1967)	10-00
6.	-do- Vol. XI Parts 1 & 2 (1968)	10-00
7.	-do- Vol. XII Parts 1 & 2 (1969)	10-00
8.	-do- Vol. XIII Parts 1 & 2 (1970)	10-00
9.	-do- Vol. XIV Parts 1 & 2 (1971)	15-00
10.	Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita Edited with Introduction by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968 2-50
11.	Apaṇinīya-prāmāṇya-sādhanaṁ of Narayana Bhaṭṭapāda Edited with Introduction, English Translation and Notes by Prof. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.	1968 0-75
12.	Kāvyaṃṛtam of Śrīvatsalāñchana Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971 3-25
13.	Kamalāvilāsabhāṇa of Nārāyaṇakavi Edited with Introduction by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.	1971 0-50

14. Vijayavikramavyāyoga of Āryasūrya  
 Edited with Introduction by  
 Dr. K S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1972 } Price  
 to be  
 fixed
15. An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu  
 and Tamil Manuscripts (Palm-leaf and Paper)  
 in the Sri Venkateswara University Oriental  
 Research Institute Library, Tirupati. 1956 10-00

### FORTHCOMING PUBLICATIONS

16. Pradyumnacaritramu (Telugu) of Muppirāla  
 Subbarāyakavi  
 Edited with Introduction and Notes by  
 Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.
17. Kṛṣṇavilāsa (a Kāvya in 11 cantos) of Puṇyakoṭi with  
 Vyākhyāna  
 Edited with Introduction by  
 Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D.

- 
1. All the above Publications are now supplied only on pre-payment of cost and postage either by money-order or demand draft, payable to the Registrar of this University.

This condition of pre-payment may be relaxed to some extent in the case of Registered Publishers, Local Library Authorities, Universities, Affiliated Colleges and other recognised Educational Institutions in India on correspondence. A nominal discount of 5% to 10% may be allowed to them on their own merits.

2. A trade discount of 25% is allowed to all the Registered Book-sellers only.
3. The annual subscription rates of the S. V. University Oriental Journal are as follows :

1. Inland	... Rs. 15/- (Post free)
2. Foreign*	... £ 1 and 15 shillings or 4 Dollars.

\*The Journal is sent post free by Surface mail, but if the party requires it to be despatched by air-mail, the air-mail charges have to be borne by the party.

N.B: The foreign rates of volumes I to XIII are 20 Shillings or 2 Dollars and 50 cents.

**SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY**  
**ORIENTAL JOURNAL**  
**TIRUPATI**

1. The Journal is the official organ of the Sri Venkateswara University
2. Each volume of the Journal appears in 2 Parts—Part 1 in June and Part 2 in December.
3. Contributions on indological subjects and oriental culture are accepted from the reputed scholars mainly in three languages—English, Sanskrit and Telugu.
4. Each contribution must be legibly and clearly written or typewritten on only one side of the paper and sent made completely press ready.
5. The Editor reserves to himself the right of accepting, rejecting or modifying any contribution received for publication. Contributors are advised to keep copies of their articles as the editor does not undertake the responsibility to return the rejected articles.
6. Every author will receive 25 off-prints of his or her article free of charge besides a copy of the issue of the journal containing that particular article.
7. Books on Indology in English, Sanskrit, Dravidian languages and Hindi are reviewed in the Journal. Two copies of the books intended for review are to be sent to the Editor.
8. All enquiries and communications regarding the editing and publishing of the Journal should be addressed to

*The Editor,*

**S. V. UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL**  
**TIRUPATI - 517502**  
**(Andhra Pradesh), South India.**

---

**Printed by :** The Registrar, S.V. University at the S.V. University Press, Tirupati,  
30-11-1972. 300 copies.

**Published by :** Prof. J. CHENNA REDDY, M.A., Ph.D., Director, S.V. University  
Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati.

